DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 665 HE 021 633

AUTHOR Berman, Paul; And Others
TITLE Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education. Volume III, Appendix. Report 88-20.
INSTITUTION Berman, Weiler Associates, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Jan 88
NOTE 179p.; For related documents, see HE 021 631-632.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *College Faculty; College Instruction; *Community Colleges; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Needs Assessment; Professional Continuing Education; Program Costs; Questionnaires; Released Time; Sabbatical Leaves; *State Colleges; *State Universities; Statistical Analysis; Statistical Bias; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation; Travel
IDENTIFIERS *California; California Community Colleges; California State University; University of California

ABSTRACT

The third volume of this three-part report provides additional information concerning a study of faculty development in the three segments of California public higher education: the University of California, California State University, and the California Community Colleges. Section I of this volume presents study findings and background material on faculty development that were not included in Volume II (Findings): context and categories of faculty development, faculty perceptions of effectiveness, and development activity by rank and gender. Section II describes the study's design and methodology. Section III presents statistical estimates bearing on the findings presented in the first two volumes (inter-subject variation, non-response bias, and gender and rank biases). Thirty-five tables are presented. Two appendices list the members of the study's advisory committee and examples of study data collection instruments which comprise one-third of the document. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CA Postsecondary

Education Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EXPLORING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

IN

CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION

Prepared for the
California Postsecondary Education Commission

Volume III

APPENDIX

Paul Berman
Jo-Ann Intili
Daniel Weiler

January 1988

R-111/3

Berman, Weiler Associates
1149 Amador Avenue
Berkeley, California 94707

COMMISSION REPORT 88-20
PUBLISHED MARCH 1988

THIS is one in a series of consultants' reports on issues affecting faculty and staff development in California public education. These reports are brought to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for discussion rather than for action, and they represent the interpretation of the consultants rather than the formal position of the Commission as expressed in its adopted resolutions and reports.

A complete list of reports from the Commission's staff development project appears on the back cover under numbers 88-17 through 88-23.

Like other publications of the Commission, this report is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 88-20 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

PREFACE

This volume is an Appendix to a report on a study of faculty development in California public higher education. The study was performed for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), as required by the 1986 Budget Act (Item 6420-011-001).

Volume I of this report is an Executive Summary, which provides a broad overview of the study's findings and offers broad conclusions. Volume II presents the main findings of the study.

The volume is organized in three parts. Section I presents study findings and background material on faculty development that were not included in Volume II. Section II describes the study's design and methodology. Section III presents statistical estimates bearing on the findings presented in Volumes I and II. Appendix A lists the members of the study's advisory committee; Appendix B presents examples of study data collection instruments.

CONTENTS

		Page
Preface		i
Section		
I.	Additional Background Material and Findings	1
	A. The Context of Faculty Development	1
	1. A National Perspective	2
	2. The Segmental Context	10
	B. Categories of Faculty Development Activities	19
	C. Faculty Perceptions of Effectiveness	25
	D. Development Activity by Rank and Gender	27
	1. The Effect of Rank	27
	2. The Effect of Gender	32
II.	Study Methods	39
	A. Overview of Research Design	39
	1. Background	39
	2. Research Questions and Design Objectives	40
	3. Main Design Features	41
	4. Design Constraints and Their Implications	46
	B. The Faculty Level Analysis	51
	1. Sampling and Weighting Procedures	51
	2. Faculty Questionnaire Development and Administration	65
	C. The Campus Level Analysis	71
	1. CCC Campus Survey II Population and Sample	71
	2. Campus Survey Development and Administration	73
	3. Approach to Estimating Expenditures	76

CONTENTS (cont)

		Page
III.	Statistical Estimates	85
	A. Inter-Subject Variation	85
	B. Non-Response Bias	85
	C. Gender and Rank Biases	85
Appendix		
	A. Advisory Committee Members and Observers	105
	B. Examples of Data Collection Instruments	111

List of Tables

Table		Page
I.A.1	Institutions Across the Nation with Faculty Development Programs, 1984	8
I.B.1	Categorization of Campus Services and Support for Faculty Development	20
I.C.1	Faculty Perceptions of Effectiveness of Development Activities	26
I.D.1a	Estimated Development Activity by Rank, Specific Activities, UC	28
I.D.1b	Estimated Development Activity by Rank, Specific Activities, CSU	29
I.D.1c	Estimated Development Activity by Rank, Specific Activities, CCC	30
I.D.2	Estimated Development Activity by Rank, Overall Measures	31
I.D.3	Estimated Development Activity by Gender, Overall Measures	33
I.D.4	Estimated Development Activity by Rank and Gender, Specific Activities	34
I.D.5a	Estimated Development Activity by Rank and Gender, UC	35
I.D.5b	Estimated Development Activity by Rank and Gender, CSU	36
I.D.5c	Estimated Development Activity by Rank and Gender, CCC	37
I.D.6	Estimated Development Activity by Rank and Gender, Overall Measures	38
II.A.1	Overview of Research Design	42
II.B.1	Rank, Gender and Ethnicity of Teaching Faculty	53
II.B.2a	Disciplinary Focus of Faculty, UC Excluding UCSF	55

List of Tables, (cont)

Table		Page
II.B.2a.1	Disciplinary Focus of Faculty, UCSF	56
II.B.2b	Disciplinary Focus of Faculty, CSU	57
II.B.2c	Disciplinary Focus of Faculty, CCC	58
II.B.3	Full-Time Teaching Faculty by Campus	59
II.B.4	Sampling Rates by Segment, Rank, Gender and Ethnicity	61
II.B.5	The Responding Sample of Faculty by Rank, Gender and Ethnicity	63
III.1	Standard Errors for Estimates of Faculty Development Activity, UC	88
III.2	Standard Errors for Estimates of Faculty Development Activity, CSU	89
III.3	Standard Errors for Estimates of Faculty Development Activity, CCC	90
III.4	Standard Errors for Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Specific Activities, UC	91
III.5	Standard Errors for Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Specific Activities, CSU	92
III.6	Standard Errors for Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Specific Activities, CCC	93
III.7	Standard Errors for Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Overall Measures, UC	94
III.8	Standard Errors for Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Overall Measures, CSU	95
III.9	Standard Errors for Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Overall Measures, CCC	96

List of Tables (cont)

Table		Page
III.10	Standard Errors for Estimated Faculty Time Spent on Development, UC	97
III.11	Standard Errors for Estimated Faculty Time Spent on Development, CSU	98
III.12	Standard Errors for Estimated Faculty Time Spent on Development, CCC	99
III.13	Analysis of Non-Respondent Participation Rates by Rank and Gender, UC	101

I. ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND MATERIAL AND FINDINGS

Part A of this section presents additional background material on the national and state context for faculty development. Part B provides additional descriptions of categories of faculty development activities, and Parts C and D respectively present additional findings on faculty perceptions of program effectiveness, and faculty participation in development by rank, gender, and discipline.

These materials were omitted from Volume II because they are not central to the main findings, and would have added significantly to the bulk of that volume.

A. THE CONTEXT OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

California's assessment of higher education faculty development policies is taking place against a background of growing national concern over the quality of undergraduate instruction, and a history of efforts to increase faculty vitality and professionalism. The more immediate context for this assessment is California's higher education system, whose three segments differ greatly in mission, organization, student characteristics, and resources. Moreover, the sheer magnitude of each segment, coupled

with the relative autonomy of the campuses, has led to significant variation within each segment in approaches to faculty development. This section provides an overview of these issues.

1. A National Perspective

Pressures on the Faculty

Powerful demographic, social and economic trends have converged over the last decade to create severe challenges for the faculty at America's colleges and universities:[1]

1. Student Diversity. What would have been a novel idea only a few decades ago is commonplace today -- that higher education should be available to all qualified persons regardless of family income, sex, ethnic origin, religion, or handicap. The result has been extraordinary growth, not only in sheer numbers of students but in student diversity. Growing numbers of "nontraditional" students -- adults, ethnic minorities, immigrants, students from lower socioeconomic levels, and women -- have enrolled in postsecondary education, and more are expected. Between 1973 and 1983, overall college attendance grew about 30 percent. At the same time, the growth in attendance for ethnic minorities was over 85 percent; and for students 25 to 34 years of age, almost 70 percent. Between 1970 and 1983, the enrollment of women grew 82 percent, to more than half of total college enrollment. These students have brought to higher education an unprecedented range of interests, learning styles and skills.

2. Inadequate Student Preparation. The academic preparation of the average college student has declined markedly over the last two decades. Between 1964 and

---

[1] Statistical sources consulted for the following discussion include U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstracts and Historical Statistics of the United States, and U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Center for Statistics, Digest of Educational Statistics, various years.

1982 "student performance [declined] on 11 of 15 major Subject Area Tests of the Graduate Record Examination";[2] between 1971 and 1985 the number of college freshmen reporting they would need tutoring nearly doubled. On many campuses, these problems have created a very real tension "between democratic values and the effort to maintain standards for an undergraduate education."[3]

3. Shift in Student Demand for Courses. Enrollments within institutions have shifted away from the liberal arts, social sciences and humanities and into business, technology, and the professions. Between 1971 and 1983 bachelor's degrees awarded in mathematics and foreign languages declined 50 percent, and in the social sciences 40 percent, while the number of engineering degrees went up more than 60 percent, and degrees in business and management nearly doubled. The distribution of faculty among disciplines has not kept pace with these shifts. Tenured faculty in many areas have had to deal with declining enrollments, shrinking support budgets and research funds, and differential, market-driven salary policies that leave them behind.

4. Knowledge Explosion. Many fields have experienced a geometric increase in knowledge and information over the past few decades, accompanied by rapid progress in the development and use of new technologies. The service and information-based sectors of the U.S. economy are creating diverse jobs, with a significant expansion of the need for retraining and continuing education. Employees and businessmen alike increasingly need to possess a high level of general competence, including the ability to learn, to solve problems, and to adapt to changing working conditions. And jobs that are created in high technology areas are requiring new skills. These developments are stimulating the use of technology in education, increasing the importance of a strong general education for all students, and requiring students to become familiar with the technological tools of the new workplace. Keeping current with these changes has become a major challenge for faculty, made

---

[2] National Institute of Education, Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education, Washington, D.C., 1984.

[3] Association of American Colleges, Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community, Washington, D.C., 1985.

more difficult by the speed with which costly equipment and facilities become obsolete.

5. The Greying Profession. By the year 2000 more than half of postsecondary faculty in the United States will be over fifty-five years old. Where mandatory retirement requirements are relaxed many of these faculty are expected to remain working well into their sixties or beyond, because declines in real salaries have reduced the value of benefits from early retirement. The prevailing view is that older faculty are often less vital and productive -- and occasionally "burnt out". Many faculty now report feeling immobilized in their professions -- unable to advance their careers by moving to better positions at other institutions. Concern is growing that these feelings often lead to lower self-esteem, disengagement from work, and resistance to change and innovation.[4]

Observers have argued that the present and future pressures described above are likely to accelerate such difficulties as "burn out", mid-career crises, and loss of productivity. For example, the University of Hawaii recently published a faculty development plan that listed the following changes in faculty environment as reasons for taking major initiatives in faculty development:

- Steady state or loss of faculty positions
- Less career mobility
- Mid-career inertia or career redirection
- High tenured rate
- Relaxation of mandatory retirement
- Tenure pressures on new faculty (fewer slots, higher standards)
- Changing disciplines/new technology
- Institutional refocus or retrenchment.

These trends, coupled with America's reluctant realization that it must be competitive in a global economy, underlie demands

---

[4] See, e.g., S.M. Clark and D.R. Lewis, eds., Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity: Critical Perspectives for Higher Education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1985.

from many quarters for a reexamination of teaching in higher education, and for more and better faculty development -- that is, for activities, programs, and resources aimed at assisting faculty to improve their ability to teach and conduct research in a rapidly changing environment.

History of Faculty Development[5]

Faculty development in higher education is an old idea. Colleges and universities have long provided their professors with opportunities to enhance their knowledge, improve their scholarship, and contribute new research findings.

Sabbatical leaves -- the oldest form of faculty development -- were begun at Harvard University in 1810. By the 1890's most of the more affluent universities had instituted sabbatical and other paid leaves. These programs had essentially one purpose -- to facilitate research and publication. Concern with teaching was rare.

This pattern continued through the first half of the twentieth century (though as late as 1970 only about sixty percent of

---

[5] The following discussion draws on a number of studies of professional development, in particular, K.E. Eble and W.J. McKeachie, Improving Undergraduate Education Through Faculty Development: An Analysis of Effective Programs and Practices, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985; J.G. Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal: Advances in Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975; W.C. Nelson, Renewal of the Teacher Scholar: Faculty Development in the Liberal Arts College, Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1981; and J.A. Centra, Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities, Project Report 76-30, Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

the nation's four-year colleges and universities had established sabbatical leave plans). The chief purpose of sabbatical and other paid leaves remained research, writing, and study, and leaves were often tied to specific research projects that required free time to travel. Other faculty development activities also began to appear. Pre-college workshops were designed to orient new faculty, and established faculty could obtain funding support for attendance at professional meetings. Academic departments held conferences on research topics, and occasionally on instructional approaches. But there were as yet few comprehensive faculty development programs.

The flowering of innovation in the late 60's opened the way for bolder faculty development efforts. Several large universities created campus programs designed explicitly to help faculty improve curriculum and instruction. By the late 1970's, faculty development had begun to take on a broader meaning, and development activities had begun to expand beyond the sabbatical tradition. Still, studies conducted in the early 70's found that only about ten percent of colleges surveyed reported programs of specific support for teaching (and only about sixty percent reported such programs for faculty research).

Within the space of a few years faculty development programs proliferated. By 1976, almost half of the nation's two-and four-year institutions were funding some kind of separate campus faculty development unit. Most were quite new -- and were being modestly funded and staffed -- but a new pattern was being set.

By the mid-seventies, faculty development was defined by one author as any activity aimed at "enhancing the talents, expanding the interests, improving the competence, and otherwise facilitating the professional and personal growth of faculty members, particularly in their role as instructors."[6] And by the mid-eighties, two-thirds of the nation's colleges and universities were sponsoring some kind of faculty development program, as shown in Table I.A.1.

Current Status of Faculty Development

Recent pressures for reform in higher education have highlighted the potential importance of faculty development. The nation's colleges and universities face growing demands for improvements in the quality of undergraduate education; at least a half-dozen national or regional commissions, study groups, associations or foundations have published reports since 1984 calling for major changes in higher education. In particular, the reports have recommended that four-year colleges and universities place a much higher priority on instructional quality when structuring faculty incentive and reward systems, and that the undergraduate curriculum be broadly revised and strengthened to integrate disciplinary knowledge, focus in depth on basic subject areas, and prepare students to think critically and continue

---

[6] Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal.

TABLE I.A.1

INSTITUTIONS ACROSS THE NATION WITH FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS
1984[1]

Type of Program	% of Institutions			
	Two Yr. Colleges	Four Yr. Colleges Offering BA, BS	Univs.	All Inst.
Institutions with a Formal Program	69.5	65.7	58.4	66.0
Workshop or Symposia	97.0	87.3	81.2	91.2
Teaching-Improvement Programs	65.1	57.1	71.8	64.1
Individualized Approaches	71.8	75.9	75.9	73.7
A Separate Budget	60.3	73.5	73.7	66.6
A Coordinator/Committee	57.9	59.3	68.8	60.4
Released Time for Course Dev.	54.9	51.9	60.8	55.2
Total Number of Institutions Surveyed	1311	739	573	2023
Institutions with Formal Programs	911	486	334	1731

[1] Source: American Council on Education, Campus Trends, 1984. Washington, D.C.: ACE, Higher Education Panel Report Number 65, February 1985.

learning beyond college.[7] Most observers believe that such steps will require a serious investment in faculty development.

As shown above in Table I.A.1, most institutions now provide some development opportunities; indeed, there has been a proliferation of practices, activities, and different types of programs. Practices range from releasing faculty from teaching duties; to providing information or funding support for research, curriculum development, or improving teaching; to providing personal assistance in instructional, curriculum or other areas of concern.[8] And with the late 1960's expansion of faculty development beyond traditional sabbatical leaves, colleges and universities began to

---

[7] Some of these studies had a relatively limited focus (e.g., teacher education), or treated special issues (e.g., science education). But the most influential reports are broadly concerned with the quality of undergraduate education. They discuss the purposes of a college education, critique current practices, and offer numerous recommendations, particularly on curriculum and the course of study, teaching, the treatment of students, and accountability. See National Institute of Education, Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: 1984; F. Newman, Higher Education and the American Resurgence, Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985; E.L. Boyer, College: The Undergraduate Experience in America, New York: Harper and Row, for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987; Association of American Colleges, Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community, Washington, D.C.: 1985; W.J. Bennett, To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984; and T.H. Bell, To Secure the Blessings of Liberty, A Report of the National Commission on the Role and Future of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1986.

[8] One recent study identified thirty-seven different faculty development practices at a group of midwestern universities and colleges, and the list was by no means exhaustive. See K.E. Eble and W.J. McKeachie, Improving Undergraduate Education Through Faculty Development.

create faculty development centers or programs administered by campus and system administrators, or faculty on part-time assignment. These centers or programs typically provide or administer grants to faculty for curriculum or instructional improvement. They also disseminate information on grant opportunities, provide evaluation and consultation on teaching and curriculum, or help faculty prepare grant applications.

Despite these changes, however, the most commonly offered services and activities across the country remain those that have dominated faculty development programs for the last twenty years: sabbaticals, release time, workshops, travel grants for conference attendance, and mini-research grants. The nature of these activities and, more importantly, the need for faculty development differs according to the size, mission and culture of the institution, as we shall see when reviewing faculty development programs at California's three higher education segments. We turn next to a brief discussion of that segmental context.

2. The Segmental Context

Our research shows that differences among and within the segments in program scope and characteristics have been strongly influenced by differences in student demography, system missions, and campus circumstances, history, and values. These contextual variables are discussed below.

Student Diversity[9]

California, like many other states, has experienced substantial growth over the last two decades and more in its ethnic minority and immigrant populations. Opportunities for women -- and, to a lesser extent, for ethnic minorities -- have grown in California's economy, and students from these groups have enrolled in postsecondary education in increasing numbers (women have for some time comprised half or more of total postsecondary enrollment). Many are returning students, or work part (or full) time.[10] While much of the growth in ethnic minority (except Asian) enrollment has been at the community colleges, both UC and CSU have made substantial efforts to increase the numbers of these students on their campuses -- with mixed results. At UC about 24 percent of Black freshmen and 15 percent of Hispanic freshmen were admitted in fall 1987 under special action programs that waive normal admissions requirements. At CSU, about 60 percent of Black

---

[9] The discussion in this subsection and those immediately following draws on issues papers prepared for the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education; CPEC studies; state and segment statistical sources; and study fieldwork.

[10] The average age of community college students is 30; some 70 percent work at least 35 hours per week. At CSU, the average age of lower division students is 24; nearly three-fourths work more than 20 hours per week. At UC, the average age of lower division students is about 19; some 60 percent work an average of 16 hours per week.

There are more part-time than full-time students in California higher education (58 percent to 42 percent), with much of this imbalance accounted for by the 70 percent part-time enrollment at community colleges. About 30 percent of all CSU undergraduates attend part-time; less than 10 percent of UC undergraduates do so.

and one-third of Hispanic first-time freshmen are admitted in this way.[11] At both UC and CSU, these "special admit" students are far less likely than other students to earn degrees.

As the discussion above implies, the growth in diversity of student populations has had quite different impacts on each of the three segments. Students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds, including many ethnic minority students and immigrants, have had much lower rates of eligibility for UC and CSU than have white or Asian students, and, generally, a much greater need to remain employed part time while attending college. They are therefore enrolled most heavily at the community colleges. This pattern holds true as well for older students, including returning students seeking continuing education. For these students, community colleges often tend to be more accessible, and more accommodating of their need for evening or weekend classes. The community colleges have in consequence had to make perhaps the greatest adjustments to student diversity, and are likely to continue to face this challenge in the years ahead.[12]

At all three segments, large numbers of students have enrolled without being fully prepared to accomplish college-level

---

[11] Even with these special admissions, Black and Hispanic enrollment in these segments remains low. At CSU, Black and Hispanic students make up about 6 and 10 percent, respectively, of student enrollment; at UC, they are about 5 and 10 percent of all students. At both segments, these enrollments are well below the proportion of Blacks and Hispanics of college age in the general population.

[12] See, e.g., CPEC, Population and Enrollment Trends, 1985-2000, Commission Report 85-16, Chapter Six, "Differences in Segmental Clientele," Sacramento: 1985.

work. This has not been solely a problem for minority underrepresented and low socioeconomic status students; the need for remediation appears to cut across all socioeconomic and ethnic lines.

At the community colleges, at least 60 percent of students who enroll for six or more credit units per term need to strengthen their skills in one or more academic areas. While definitions of what constitutes remedial education vary, it is estimated that about half of all English and mathematics sections at the community colleges are classified as remedial.[13]

At both UC and CSU, "over 50 percent of all entering freshmen require English courses at levels below the initial 'University Level' offerings, while in math, remedial courses are necessary for over 43 percent of CSU freshmen and approximately 20 percent of all UC freshmen."[14]

Challenges to California higher education are also expected as a result of continuing changes in the state's economy. With the continuing shift from an industrial to a service and informa-

---

[13] CPEC, Promises to Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities, Commission Report 83-2, Sacramento: 1983. Data on the community colleges have also been published by LARC -- the community college Learning, Assessment, Retention Consortium (see LARC, 1983-84 Program Guide, Sacramento: n.d.). There is significant variation among colleges serving different kinds of communities; remedial needs of students in some large urban colleges are greater than average. For a more complete discussion of remedial education in the community colleges, see Berman, Weiler Associates, A Study of California's Community Colleges, R-108/2, Berkeley, CA: 1985.

[14] Commission for the Review of the Master Plan, Issue Paper No. 5 (retention, remediation and related issues), December 1986, draft.

tion based economy leading to increasing diversity of employment, growing demands on higher education are predicted for retraining programs and for graduates with both broad general knowledge and technical literacy.

Missions

Decisions about professional development at each segment are heavily influenced by segment and campus views of their needs, and by the availability of resources. But these needs assessments and resource allocation decisions are also made within a framework of segmental and campus convictions about their primary missions and the priorities implied by those missions. Recent national studies have found that over the last several decades, faculty aspirations have come to be "focused increasingly on achievements in research and scholarship within their specialties . . . encouraged by a reward system that conferred the highest status and the most generous compensation on those who were outstanding achievers in research and scholarship."[15] Analysts have also found considerable tension on many campuses over the priorities assigned to teaching and research: "Faculty members like to teach," noted one study, "and yet the American professoriate has been profoundly

---

[15] H.R., Bowen, The State of the Nation and the Agenda for Higher Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

shaped by the conviction that research is the cornerstone of the profession."[16]

The issue of how to balance teaching and research priorities also lies at the heart of concerns about the missions of California's four-year higher education segments; a review prepared for the Master Plan review commission confirmed that the national patterns noted by others could also be found here.[17] The review cites several recent papers prepared at UC in charging that undergraduate education there is too often neglected in favor of research.[18]

With regard to CSU, the Commission review reports "common knowledge in educational circles that there are divisions within the CSU as to the role of scholarship or research in the promotion policies of various campuses. Some of the colleges are already defined . . . as quasi-research institutions, with research

---

[16] E.L. Boyer, College: The Undergraduate Experience in America, New York: Harper and Row, for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987.

[17] Commission for the Review of the Master Plan, Issue Paper 11 (undergraduate education, teaching incentives, and related topics), Sacramento: February 1987, draft.

[18] The papers cited by the Commission review are A.E. Taylor, "Undergraduate Education in the University of California," Berkeley: 1975; N.J. Smelser (Task Force Chair), Lower Division Education in the University of California, University of California Task Force Report, Berkeley: 1986; and University of California, Los Angeles, "A Need for Reform: A Student Perspective on UCLA Undergraduate Education," Los Angeles: 1986. The review also quotes the director of the UC Berkeley freshman English program to the effect that undergraduates will get a "third-rate education" there, and repeats the UCLA student report's reference to the University's "almost total preoccupation with research and graduate training."

criteria very much in evidence for advancement to tenure." The Commission paper goes on to cite a study conducted at one CSU campus which pointed to faculty frustration at a teaching load that was too high given research demands. Faculty on this campus, according to the cited study, "display attitudes and behaviors that are not typical of comprehensive institution faculties. We are, in fact, much more like faculty in the `other doctoral' institutions."[19]

At the community colleges, teaching lower division students remains the primary mission, and there has been no tension between this mission and research. Within this mission, however, emphases have changed over time to accommodate the growing numbers of students interested in part-time attendance, and rapid training or retraining and access to jobs. Adjustments have also had to be made to provide remedial instruction for the growing numbers of students who were not prepared for college-level work. In consequence, concerns have been raised that the community colleges have neglected the academic/transfer studies part of their mission, and have had to eliminate critical course offerings, counseling, and assessment services because of budget reductions in the 80's.[20]

---

[19] The cited study is CSU, Fullerton, "Faculty Attitudes at Cal State Fullerton Similar to Those at Doctoral Institutions," Senate Forum, Fullerton: December 1986.

[20] See Berman, Weiler Associates, A Study of California's Community Colleges, R-108/1-3, Berkeley: 1985, 3 Volumes.

Our study fieldwork confirmed many of the patterns discussed above, as detailed in Volume II. At the same time -- and the Commission's review does not make this clear -- we found great variation both among campuses within segments and between schools and departments on the same campus. In no case, for example, did we find that all faculty at a UC or CSU campus were more concerned with research than with teaching; even on campuses where research concerns predominated, some departments and many faculty placed a high priority on undergraduate instruction. Moreover, both at UC and CSU there were significant differences in campus history, culture, and values. These differences are discussed briefly below.

Variation Within Segments

On major dimensions, inter-segmental differences are real and pervasive: UC is a research university that enrolls the top eighth of California high school graduates; CSU is a comprehensive institution with serious uncertainty about the relative value of research and instruction; CCC is a lower division teaching institution serving a largely part-time, employed, older, and otherwise more diverse student population. But there are also major differences within each segment. Campus size, for example, can strongly influence campus climate and culture for both students and faculty, and differences in campus size are

substantial in each segment.[21]

Campus location can also make a difference, particularly proximity to urban centers or relative rural isolation. At some of the more isolated campuses, there are many fewer commuting students. Greater numbers of residential students can help to create closer student-faculty relations (with more opportunities for informal student-faculty contact), and have the advantage of being able to integrate students more closely into college life and culture. Students from these institutions have historically had dramatically higher rates of graduation within four to seven years of college entry.[22]

Size, location, and proportions of commuting and residential students all influence campus cultures, but so do the unique histories of each campus -- each with its own view of its special strengths and traditions, passed on to each generation of new

---

[21] At UC, the largest campuses serve about 30,000 students (undergraduate and graduate); the smallest only some 5,000. From the perspective of faculty size, the largest campus employs some 2,600 (FTE) teaching faculty; the smallest about 400.

At CSU, the largest campus enrolls about 32,000 undergraduate and graduate students, and employs some 1,100 full-time faculty; the smallest campus enrolls about 3,500 students and employs only 150 full-time faculty.

At CCC, campus size ranges from a total (part- and full-time) student enrollment of some 23,000 with 380 (FTE) faculty, to 650 students and 19 faculty.

[22] Commission for the Review of the Master Plan, Issue Paper No. 5 (retention and related topics), Sacramento: December 1986, draft.

Campus size is not always correlated with capacity for housing residential students. CSU San Louis Obispo, for example, is the twelfth largest campus in the system, but has the largest residential hall student capacity; it is not located in an area convenient to commuting students. (The California State University, Statistical Abstract to July 1985, Long Beach: 1986.

faculty. In study fieldwork visits, we visited campuses where the faculty were clear that their campus had a history of pride in the quality of its undergraduate instruction -- and some where teaching excellence had lower priority. There were also significant differences in the relative amounts of resources devoted to professional development, and in the ways such programs were organized and administered.

On balance, their are great variations within segments. Differences in size, location, student demography, history and values, resources, faculty characteristics and leadership all contribute to this variation. In all three segments, decentralized decision-making with considerable campus autonomy provides ample opportunity for differences among campuses on these dimensions to result in widely different pictures of faculty development.

B. CATEGORIES OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

California's higher education institutions provide or support a wide range of faculty development programs and activities. The study's surveys and fieldwork collected information on more than sixty distinct development programs, which can be categorized into seven major groups of services or support to faculty, as shown in Table I.B.1.

TABLE I.B.1

CATEGORIZATION OF CAMPUS SERVICES AND SUPPORT
FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

I. SERVICES TO FACULTY

A. Information

Direct presentation of information and ideas in workshops, etc.
Publications
Courses
Dissemination of information on faculty development activities

B. Personal Assistance

Peer assistance
Specialist assistance
Training or retraining
Personal counseling
Provision or repair of equipment

C. Research on How to Improve Faculty Development Services and Activities

D. Evaluations of Faculty Performance

II. SUPPORT OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES

A. Releasing Faculty From Teaching Duties

Leaves
Released time
Adjusting the length of the academic year
for purposes of faculty development

B. Funding Support

Grants
Cash awards
Travel funding
Payment of education costs
Summer Salary increments
Support for faculty exposure to new information
Materials acquisition
Support for collegial communication

C. Other Support

Recognition
Infrastructure and management support

The first part of Table I.B.1 lists categories of development services provided directly by institutions to their faculties. These services aim to improve faculty teaching, student assessment, and advising skills; help faculty with curriculum development, or the design or execution of research (or of creative projects in the arts); or help faculty stay current in a field or discipline. The second part of Table I.B.1 lists categories of support provided by institutions to their faculty to enable them to improve their teaching, advising and student assessment skills, develop curriculum, conduct research, or stay current in their fields.

We found the following range of activities within each of the direct service categories:

A. Information provided to faculty included --

1. Direct presentation of information and ideas. A wide variety of formats were used for these purposes, including conferences, workshops, orientation sessions, support groups, seminars, institutes, symposia, colloquia, retreats, lectures, and (in the arts) performances.

2. Publications containing substantive information, such as research reports or journal articles, circulated to faculty. Articles might discuss teaching techniques, provide tips on curriculum, review research methods, discuss approaches to student assessment, etc.

3. Courses on specialized subjects created and taught for faculty. Courses might cover teaching techniques, the use of computers in instruction, or recent technical advances in a vocational specialty.

4. Dissemination of information on faculty development activities and opportunities at the institution,

through newsletters, brochures, circulars, bulletins, etc.

B. Personal assistance to faculty included --

1. Peer assistance, such as senior faculty acting as mentors to junior peers.

2. Specialist assistance in the form of individual consultations and expert advice. Such assistance could come from a variety of sources, including staff from a campus resource center established for this purpose, computer center or language laboratory staff, a campus administrator (or faculty member on part-time assignment) assigned to this role, or an industry advisory group. Assistance might be rendered on teaching techniques, curriculum development, computer skills, research methods, writing skills, student advising, assessment approaches or test preparation, affirmative action issues, or grant proposal preparation, as well as other topics.

3. Training or retraining faculty in computer use, research methods, or new disciplines.

4. Personal counseling on problems such as depression, burn-out, alcoholism, writer's block, career anxiety.

5. Provision or repair of equipment, including access to computers and audio-visual equipment; and development or provision of teaching or research materials.

C. Research on how to improve faculty development services and activities was sometimes conducted by specialists associated with campus resource centers, to sharpen their own skills as specialists and/or to provide new information to faculty on teaching techniques or other topics.

D. Evaluations of faculty performance included peer reviews, and evaluations by students and administrators. Feedback to faculty from these evaluations was a widely-cited source of information and incentives for faculty development.

We found the following range of activities within each of the support categories:

A. Releasing faculty from teaching duties included --

1. Leaves -- sabbaticals, difference in pay leaves, paid leaves, and leaves and partial leaves without pay. Sabbaticals were most often employed for conducting research, though occasionally they were used for curriculum development or for improving teaching skills. Paid leaves were often used for the same purposes, though they might also be used for temporary reassignments within the institution or related purposes. Unpaid leaves were taken for a wider variety of purposes, including personal time.

2. Released time (also called assigned time at CSU). Faculty were excused (released) from part of their normal teaching load during a semester or quarter, or were released from all teaching for one or more semesters or quarters. They were expected to use this extra time to conduct research or other scholarly activities, improve teaching or related skills, develop new curriculum, etc. Often, a faculty member on released time was assigned a special task within the institution, such as administering a campus resource center or coordinating campus faculty development programs.

3. Adjusting the length of the academic year so that instructors may participate in faculty development activities. This practice is unique to the community colleges.

B. Funding support for faculty activities included --

1. Grants and mini-grants made for research projects, preparing proposals to secure outside research funding, curriculum development, activities designed to improve teaching, and retraining to enable faculty to teach in a new field, among other purposes.

2. Cash awards made in recognition of outstanding teaching, or to help faculty complete pre- or post-doctoral work. Awards also took the form of fellowships, honoraria, special stipends and loan forgiveness.

3. Travel funding to support faculty attendance at conferences and other professional activities away from campus. Funding could cover only transportation expenses, or could also pay for per diem expenses, conference fees, and related costs.
4. Payment of education costs for faculty who enrolled in classes in order to stay current in their field or improve their skills. Fees for courses given off campus could be paid, as could the costs of off-campus internships or field visits. Fees for courses taken on campus were often waived.

5. Summer (or 4th quarter) Salary increments provided to faculty in order to support curriculum development, research, or work on new approaches to instruction.

6. Support for faculty exposure to new information, such as faculty exchanges (within or between segments or institutions), funding visiting scholars or faculty off-campus residencies (here or abroad), and supporting faculty internships, either within the institution (e.g., in an administrative post) or with business or industry.

7. Materials acquisition -- purchasing or securing the donation of equipment, software, books and journals or other research, curriculum or instructional materials that could not otherwise be provided by the institution.

8. Support for collegial communication, including the payment of professional association dues and other costs, and telephone and postage expenses associated with professional communication.

C. Other support for faculty development activities included --

1. Recognition of outstanding teaching or community service, without an accompanying monetary award.
2. Infrastructure and management support in the form of administrative and clerical assistance to various staff development programs or activities, and provision of student assistants, campus computer support, and facilities and office space.

C. FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF EFFECTIVENESS

This study's charter did not include an evaluation of the effectiveness of faculty development activities. However, we did ask faculty to rate the activities they engaged in according to a five point scale -- very ineffective, ineffective, somewhat effective, very effective, and extremely effective. Table I.C.1 shows the results of their ratings.

The reader should note that the validity of this measurement is subject to at least two major concerns. First, faculty were asked for their perceptions of effectiveness, which might be quite different from the independent assessments of evaluators. Second, the question about an activity's effectiveness was asked only of faculty who elected to participate in that activity, and such faculty might be biased in rating the activity more positively than others who might not be inclined toward the activity. In light of these issues, we believe it would be inadvisable to interpret the meaning of effectiveness literally. However, the patterns of answers revealed in Table I.C.1 can be assumed to be indicative of the perception of the faculty about different development approaches. Therefore, the following findings should be thought of as hypotheses requiring further study:

- At UC, the highest percentage of faculty evaluated "attending professional development courses," particularly on-campus courses, as very effective. Private study activities received the next highest rating as very effective, and programmatic activities --such as using videotaping, observing peers' classrooms, assistance from specialists, and mentoring -- received a smaller percentage of "very effective" ratings.

TABLE I.C.1

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF EFFECTIVENESS OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Who Engaged in Development Activity and Reported It Was Very or Extremely Effective		
	UC	CSU	CCC
Videotaping of Own Teaching	40%	53%	61%
Observation of Peer's Classes	51%	49%	60%
Direct Assistance from Faculty Development Specialists	61%	49%	47%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	66%	63%	71%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	59%	35%	47%
Studying Specialized Fac. Development Materials (e.g., articles, training videos)	75%	73%	74%
Developing, Preparing and/or Teaching Experimental or New Courses and Curricula	76%	73%	81%
Attending On-Campus Course for Faculty Development	95%	59%	57%
Attending Off-Campus Course for Faculty Development	80%	69%	72%
Attending Summer Institute	57%	67%	78%
Other	67%	77%	75%

- CSU and CCC had similar patterns of effectiveness ratings for the various development activities. At these segments, the activities with the highest percentage of faculty evaluations as very effective were private study activities and off-campus courses and summer institutes. On-campus courses did not receive as high a rating as off-campus courses. At CSU and CCC, the percentage of faculty who were mentors and rated this activity as very effective was much higher than the percentage of faculty who were mentored and rated the program as very effective.

These segmental findings are not directly comparable, since there are substantial differences between the segments in the nature, organization, focus, and substance of faculty development activities.

D. DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY RANK AND GENDER

1. The Effect of Rank

Tables I.D.1a through I.D.1c show estimates of the percentage of faculty engaged in specific faculty development activity by faculty rank, for each segment. Table I.D.2 presents the equivalent information for combined categories of the specific activities.[23] These tables suggest the following:

- At UC, the percentage of faculty who participated in development activities was about the same regardless of

[23] The reader should note that the estimates of faculty development activity are necessarily less accurate when the data are divided into such subgroups as rank.

TABLE I.D.1a

ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY RANK
Specific Activities
UC

Type of Activity	% of Faculty Engaged in Development Activity		
	Assist. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.
Videotaping of Own Teaching	5%	4%	7%
Observation of Peer's Classes	27%	20%	19%
Direct Assistance from Faculty Development Specialists	7%	7%	7%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	4%	4%	5%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	3%	2%	0%
Studying Specialized Faculty Development Materials (e.g., articles, training videos)	38%	42%	34%
Developing, Preparing and/or Teaching Experimental or New Courses and Curricula	41%	44%	28%
Attending On-Campus Course for Faculty Development	5%	7%	6%
Attending Off-Campus Course for Faculty Development	4%	2%	4%
Participating in On-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	16%	24%	11%
Participating in Off-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	23%	24%	17%
Attending Summer Institute	2%	1%	2%
Other	8%	8%	7%

TABLE I.D.1b

ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY RANK
Specific Activities
CSU

Type of Activity	% of Faculty Engaged in Development Activity		
	Assist. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.
Videotaping of Own Teaching	12%	14%	13%
Observation of Peer's Classes	20%	20%	17%
Direct Assistance from Faculty Development Specialists	21%	20%	11%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	11%	12%	10%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	10%	6%	5%
Studying Specialized Faculty Development Materials (e.g., articles, training videos)	54%	54%	50%
Developing, Preparing and/or Teaching Experimental or New Courses and Curricula	63%	56%	48%
Attending On-Campus Course for Faculty Development	20%	20%	15%
Attending Off-Campus Course for Faculty Development	21%	23%	17%
Participating in On-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	57%	55%	46%
Participating in Off-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	84%	79%	71%
Attending Summer Institute	8%	9%	7%
Other	16%	15%	17%

TABLE I.D.1c

ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY RANK
Specific Activities
CCC

Type of Activity	% of Faculty Engaged in Development Activity	
	Non-Tenured	Tenured
Videotaping of Own Teaching	15%	14%
Observation of Peer's Classes	33%	26%
Direct Assistance from Faculty Development Specialists	22%	16%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	8%	8%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	10%	6%
Studying Specialized Faculty Development Materials (e.g., articles, training videos)	61%	65%
Developing, Preparing and/or Teaching Experimental or New Courses and Curricula	60%	49%
Attending On-Campus Course for Faculty Development	20%	20%
Attending Off-Campus Course for Faculty Development	39%	29%
Participating in On-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	55%	48%
Participating in Off-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	68%	72%
Attending Summer Institute	9%	9%
Other	17%	12%

TABLE I.D.2

ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY RANK
Overall Measures

	% of Faculty Engaged in Activity							
	UC			CSU			CCC	
Type of Activity	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Full Prof.	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Full Prof.	Tenured	Non-Tenured
No Faculty Development Activity	31	29	38	2	4	6	7	5
Only Engaged in Private Study	16	19	18	2	3	6	5	4
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc. and/or Engaged in Private-Study	11	17	7	31	27	32	25	22
Only Participated in Program. Activity	21	16	22	4	5	9	5	8
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private-Study	21	19	15	61	61	47	58	61
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

rank (although the data indicate a somewhat higher percentage of participation for assistant professors compared to full professors in observing peer's teaching, developing new courses, and participating in on- and off-campus conferences relevant to instructional improvement).

- At CSU, a higher percentage of assistant professors compared to full professors engaged in developing new courses, participating in on- and off-campus conferences, receiving assistance from specialists, and being mentored.

- The percentage of non-tenured full-time instructors at CCC engaging in development was about the same as that of tenured faculty, although the data indicate that a higher percentage of non-tenured faculty engaged in developing new courses, participating in on-campus (but not off-campus) conferences, observing peer's classrooms, receiving assistance from specialists, attending off-campus courses, and being mentored.

2. The Effect of Gender

Table I.D.3 shows the estimated percentage of faculty participation in development activities by gender. The sample was designed to overrepresent the proportion of females, due to their small percentages among the faculty. The results suggest that:

- There was more participation by females than males in faculty development activities at all segments, though the differences were generally quite small.

- In particular, the gap between the genders was greatest for the highest level of participation -- programmatic activity combined with conferences and private study. Women were more likely than men to engage in the maximum level of faculty development.

Tables I.D.4 through I.D.6 present data about the joint effect of rank and gender. Since the subgroups have small numbers, we will not draw inferences from these statistics.

TABLE I.D.3

ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY GENDER
Overall Measures

Type of Activity	% of Faculty Engaged in Activity					
	UC		CSU		CCC	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
No Faculty Development Activity	29%	36%	3%	6%	2%	9%
Only Engaged in Private-Study	14	19	3	6	3	6
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc. and/or Engaged in Private-Study	13	9	25	33	19	27
Only Participated in Program. Activity	21	21	4	9	6	5
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private-Study	23	15	65	46	69	52
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE I.D.4

ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY RANK AND GENDER
Specific Activities

Type of Activity	% of Faculty Engaged in Activities					
	UC Professor		CSU Professor		CCC Instructor	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Videotaping of Own Teaching	6%	8%	13%	12%	14%	15%
Observation of Peer's Classes	19%	24%	17%	21%	24%	30%
Direct Assist. from Specialists	7%	9%	12%	18%	15%	21%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	4%	8%	10%	13%	7%	10%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	1%	3%	6%	7%	6%	8%
Studying Specialized Materials	35%	43%	50%	54%	63%	69%
Developing New Curricula	32%	39%	49%	57%	47%	55%
Attending On-Campus Course	6%	6%	14%	25%	15%	27%
Attending Off-Campus Course	3%	4%	16%	28%	25%	39%
Participating in On-Campus Conf.	13%	20%	47%	55%	62%	61%
Participating in Off-Campus Conf.	18%	20%	71%	83%	66%	83%
Attending Summer Institute	1%	5%	6%	13%	7%	12%
Other	7%	9%	16%	18%	9%	18%

TABLE I.D.5a

ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY RANK AND GENDER
UC

Type of Activity	% of Faculty Engaging in Activities Who Are					
	Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Full Professor	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Videotaping of Own Teaching	5%	5%	3%	7%	7%	11%
Observation of Peer's Classes	28%	25%	17%	28%	19%	20%
Direct Assist. from Specialists	7%	7%	7%	10%	6%	11%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	3%	6%	2%	12%	4%	7%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	3%	5%	3%	0%	0%	2%
Studying Specialized Materials	36%	42%	41%	44%	34%	43%
Developing New Curricula	38%	47%	45%	43%	28%	29%
Attending On-Campus Course	4%	5%	8%	4%	5%	8%
Attending Off-Campus Course	4%	4%	1%	3%	4%	4%
Participating in On-Campus Conf.	14%	21%	26%	17%	10%	19%
Participating in Off-Campus Conf.	19%	3%	25%	22%	16%	29%
Attending Summer Institute	1%	4%	0%	4%	2%	7%
Other	6%	13%	8%	7%	6%	8%

TABLE I.D.5b

ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY RANK AND GENDER
CSU

Type of Activity	% of Faculty Engaging in Activities Who Are: Assistant Professor M	Assistant Professor F	Associate Professor M	Associate Professor F	Full Professor M	Full Professor F
Videotaping of Own Teaching	15%	8%	15%	13%	13%	13%
Observation of Peer's Classes	18%	22%	19%	22%	16%	20%
Direct Assist. from Specialists	22%	19%	18%	24%	10%	15%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	10%	12%	12%	11%	10%	14%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	12%	8%	6%	7%	5%	7%
Studying Specialized Materials	51%	57%	54%	54%	49%	54%
Developing New Curricula	61%	65%	58%	53%	47%	57%
Attending On-Campus Course	16%	25%	16%	29%	13%	24%
Attending Off-Campus Course	20%	23%	20%	29%	15%	29%
Participating in On-Campus Conf.	56%	58%	53%	59%	44%	51%
Participating in Off-Campus Conf.	83%	85%	76%	86%	69%	80%
Attending Summer Institute	6%	11%	7%	14%	5%	13%
Other	15%	18%	14%	20%	17%	17%

TABLE I.D.5c

ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY RANK AND GENDER
CCC

Type of Activity	% of Faculty Engaging in Activities Who Are: Non-Tenured M	Non-Tenured F	Tenured M	Tenured F
Videotaping of Own Teaching	14	16	19	9
Observation of Peer's Classes	24	30	33	33
Direct Assist. from Specialists	14	21	23	20
Mentoring Program as Mentor	7	11	10	6
Mentoring Program as Mentored	5	8	12	8
Studying Specialized Materials	63	69	57	67
Developing New Curricula	46	54	56	67
Attending On-Campus Course	15	28	18	23
Attending Off-Campus Course	24	39	32	41
Participating in On-Campus Conferences	49	64	41	60
Participating in Off-Campus Conferences	64	75	66	84
Attending Summer Institute	7	12	8	9
Other	8	17	14	23

TABLE I.D.6

ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY RANK AND GENDER
Overall Measures

	% of Faculty Engaged in Activity															
	UC						CSU						CCC			
	Asst. Prof.		Assoc. Prof.		Full Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Assoc. Prof.		Full Prof.		Tenured		Non-Tenured	
Type of Activity	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
No Faculty Development Activity	25%	33%	28%	29%	34%	39%	1%	2%	4%	4%	3%	6%	2%	10%	3%	7%
Only Engaged in Private-Study	10	19	21	18	10	18	2	2	1	4	3	6	3	7	4	4
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc. or Engaged in Private-Study	15	9	9	20	16	6	29	33	24	28	25	34	19	27	19	23
Only Participated in Program. Activity	22	21	23	14	18	22	4	5	4	6	4	10	6	4	4	12
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private-Study	28	18	19	19	22	14	64	58	67	58	64	44	69	52	70	55
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

II. STUDY METHODS

This section describes the study's design and methodology. The section is presented in four parts. Part A provides an overview of the study's research design. Part B discusses the methods employed to gather and analyze data on faculty activities and views; Part C discusses aspects of the study's approach to obtaining information on campus and segment programs and expenditures, and the views of campus and segment administrators. Part D provides examples of study questionnaires and surveys.

A. OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH DESIGN

1. Background

The 1986 Budget Act (Item 6420-011-001) appropriated funds to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) to contract for "a study of staff development in higher education." The study's purpose was to provide the state with a description of higher education faculty development activities and expenditures, so that state policymakers would have a better information base and policy framework for making decisions about faculty development budget requests from the three higher education segments. The legislature was also interested in ascertaining the view of the segments about their present and future needs for faculty

development. In the words of the CPEC request for study proposals, "the project . . . is intended to provide a clear mapping of [faculty] development activities and identified needs in public higher education [to help with the later development of] State policy alternatives for the State Legislature and the Administration."

At the direction of the legislature, CPEC convened a Higher Education Advisory Committee consisting of representatives from each of the segments, legislative staff, Department of Finance, and Legislative Analyst's Office (the list of Advisory Committee members and observers is Appendix A). The role of the Committee was to assist the contractor and CPEC in defining faculty development programs and activities, review the study design and research priorities, review study data collection plans and instruments, and provide critical feedback to the contractor on draft reports. Following a competitive bidding process, CPEC awarded the study contract to Berman, Weiler Associates in late January 1987.

2. Research Questions and Design Objectives

In light of the study charter noted above, a design was formulated to address four broad research questions:

- What types of faculty development services, support programs, and activities were available to faculty at the segments?
- What were the expenditures for faculty development

activities, and what were the sources for these expenditures?

- To what extent did faculty participate in campus-supported or other development activities?
- In the view of faculty and administrators, what development needs are not being adequately addressed?

The objective of the research design was to collect information that would provide a reliable estimate of the activities and views of the faculty at each segment, as well as information from campus and system-level administrators that could be used to describe institutional activities and views. More specifically, the design objectives were:

1. To collect data from the faculty that would enable the study to estimate their levels of participation in development activities and ascertain their views of development needs;
2. To collect data from the faculty that could contribute to estimates of expenditures for development activities;
3. To obtain information from the campuses and segments on institutional programs and expenditures; and
4. To obtain from the campuses and segments their views of faculty development needs.

3. Main Design Features

Table II.A.1 provides an overview of the study research design. The data collection was divided into three broad types of information-gathering: individual-level questionnaires, campus-level surveys, and qualitative fieldwork. Individual-level data

TABLE II.A.1

OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Method	UC	CSU	CCC
INDIVIDUAL LEVEL QUESTIONNAIRES	Stratified Random Sample of 1646 Faculty Representative of System and Campuses	Stratified Random Sample of 2738 Faculty Representative of System and Campuses	Stratified Random Sample of 1568 Faculty From Core Sample of 26 Colleges Representative of System and Campuses
CAMPUS LEVEL SURVEYS	Institutional Form for Data Collection From Nine Campuses	Institutional Form for Data Collection From Nineteen Campuses	Institutional Form for Data Collection From Core Sample of 26 Campuses
FIELDWORK VISITS AND PHONE CONTACTS	Site Visits to System-Level and Four Campuses Phone Contacts and Survey Follow-up At Up To 9 Campuses	Site Visits to System-Level and Five Campuses Phone Contacts and Survey Follow-up At Up To 19 Campuses	Site Visits to System-Level and Five Campuses From Core Sample of 26 Campuses Phone Contacts and Survey Follow-up At Up To 26 Campuses

collection from a representative sample of faculty at each segment was planned in order to be able to estimate the extent and type of faculty participation in development activities, and obtain faculty perceptions of the effectiveness of these activities and of their own needs.

Campus-level surveys were planned to collect information on faculty development programs and activities either offered directly or supported by the campuses; to develop estimates of institutional expenditures for faculty development; and to obtain campus administrations' views of their faculties' development needs. The design called for campus survey administration at all UC and CSU campuses, and at a sample of twenty-six community college campuses.[24]

The qualitative fieldwork was designed to expand our understanding of the complex ways in which faculty development programs are developed and interact on college and university campuses. We also wanted to follow up information obtained from the quantitative data collection with more in-depth exploration of faculty and administrator views. For these purposes, separate discussions were planned with key faculty, with campus administrators, and with faculty associated with programs considered to be "exemplary" on each of the campuses visited. Telephone interviews were planned with officials at campuses where fieldwork visits could

---

[24] Too few community colleges in this sample responded to the survey to permit reliable estimates for CCC data. A second (shorter) campus-level survey was therefore sent to all community colleges, to which sixty-four campuses responded. See Volume II for a discussion of CCC campus surveys I and II.

not be conducted due to time and resource constraints (discussed below). Separate fieldwork visits and phone interviews were also planned for the segmental system-level offices in Berkeley, Long Beach, and Sacramento, to obtain information about the segments' roles in directly providing or supporting faculty development. The design also called for written statements to be solicited from the segments that set forth their views of segmental needs and priorities.

Instrumentation

The research design called for collecting comparable data across the three segments, while allowing for the collection of information that is unique to each segment. Thus, separate data collection instruments were designed for each segment, but their wording and format were designed to be as similar as possible given the need to take segmental differences into account. Given the complex and unique features of each segment, the design called for several reviews of draft faculty-level questionnaires by the study Advisory Committee, in particular the segmental members. For the campus-level surveys, the design called for representatives from every UC and CSU campus and from each campus in the CCC sample to meet with the study team. The goal of these working sessions was agreement on what kinds of information could be obtained from the campuses, and on survey format and wording that would be most likely to be understood across all campuses in a segment. (These processes are discussed in more detail in

Sections II.B.2 and C.2.) For reasons discussed below, the segments were responsible for field testing and administration of all instruments, and for preparing a database for analysis according to study team specifications.

Sampling

The study employed a flexible sampling strategy designed to reflect segmental differences. The object of the sampling design was to draw the minimum sample required for accurate estimates, in order to minimize the data collection burden on the segments and maximize response rates. Generally, the design called for the segments to provide the study team with information on the numbers of faculty at each campus, including their distribution by rank, gender, and ethnicity. The study team then selected a sample for each campus such that adequate numbers of faculty would be available to allow estimates of faculty activities for each of these sampling categories. These samples were transmitted to the segments, together with guidance, where needed, on how to select sample respondents. Faculty sample totals by segment are shown in Table II.A.1 and Section II.B.2. For the campus-level surveys, the only sample employed was at the community colleges, where twenty-six colleges were selected to represent the system. The colleges selected were in one of four samples that had been constructed and used for an earlier study of occupational education in the community colleges, and were representative of the colleges along such critical dimensions as size, student charac-

teristics, and financial data. A sample of colleges was selected in order to minimize the data collection and data entry burden on the community colleges, and help maximize response rates.

4. Design Constraints and Their Implications

In formulating the research design, a number of practical constraints had to be considered that limited what the study would be able to achieve.

Resource Limitations

Severe limits on study funding had three consequences in particular for the research design: First, the study did not have the ability to combine extensive, in-depth fieldwork at the campus level with the collection of quantitative data from a large sample of faculty. The latter design component was essential in order to support reliable estimates of faculty activity, but extensive fieldwork would have been desirable in order to provide a richer, more detailed picture of complex faculty development programs at all three segments.

Second, the segments themselves, rather than the study team, were assigned the responsibility for field testing and distributing faculty questionnaires, implementing procedures to insure adequate response rates, collecting completed questionnaires, and delivering a clean computer data tape to the contractor after

entering and verifying questionnaire data. Administration and data entry for all campus-level surveys was also made entirely the responsibility of the segments. While considerable cooperation from segment and campus officials would have been necessary in any case, it was very unusual for a study team to have to relinquish direct control over the administration of its data collection instruments and the creation of its data files. This arrangement was necessary given limitations on study resources (contractor assumption of these responsibilities would have been a massive and expensive task) but this meant that the research design had to build in special procedures for coordination between study staff and key segmental and campus personnel. In addition, the study had to design questionnaires and surveys that could be administered by people who would not be trained by the contractor.

Third, limitations on study scope became necessary. In particular:

- It was not feasible to collect data from all 105 community colleges; a sample of 26 colleges was selected, and inspected by community college segmental staff to insure that it was adequately representative of all colleges.
- It was not practical to study development activities and expenditures for all categories of faculty at the three segments. It would have been particularly difficult and expensive to collect data from part-time instructors, and from faculty whose duties and/or organizational attachments were very different from those of most other faculty, e.g., faculty in special research facilities or in the health sciences at UC.
- It was not feasible to collect data on non-teaching (e.g., clerical, support, administrative) staff at the segments, in order to mount a parallel investigation of staff development for these personnel.

As a result of these limitations, the study team and the Advisory Committee agreed that:

1. The study would be restricted to full-time teaching faculty only.

2. At UC and CSU, only ladder-rank and tenure track faculty -- assistant, associate, and full professors -- would be included in the study; there would be no data collected from lecturers or instructors (with the minor exception of a small number of lecturers with security of employment -- the practical equivalent of tenure -- at UC). At the community colleges, both non-tenured (probationary) and tenured instructors would be included, but other support staff who are credentialed as faculty (e.g., counselors, student personnel workers) would not.

3. Faculty attached to campus or segment research units (e.g., agricultural experimental stations) would not be included in the study unless they also had a regular departmental affiliation and taught full time.

4. Faculty from health science units (e.g., medical schools) would not be included in the study, with the exception of the UC San Francisco campus, which was included at the request of UC officials (a separate questionnaire for UCSF faculty was developed that differed slightly from the instrument used at other UC campuses).

5. No data would be collected on staff development programs or activities for non-teaching support or administrative staff.

Segmental Differences

There are significant variations both between and within segments in the ways in which development activities are organized, managed, and funded; the types of activities participated in by different kinds of faculty; and the ways in which faculty development is conceptualized and understood. The challenge for the research design was to design data collection instruments that

could capture this variation and complexity while still maintaining sufficient uniformity to permit efficient data analysis.

One major example of differences among the segments is that they do not share common definitions of faculty development. UC treats faculty research and scholarship (e.g., keeping current in a discipline) as normal faculty responsibilities in keeping with the University's role as the primary segment for the conduct of research, not as faculty development, whereas both CSU and CCC treat faculty research and scholarship as essential components of such development. Thus, one constraint on the research design was the need to develop questionnaires and survey instruments that reflected these differences. (See Volumes I and II for discussions of the definition of faculty development.)

The Academic Calender and Study Timing

The study contract was signed -- and work authorized -- on January 30, 1987. As a practical matter, most faculty would not be available after early June, allowing only four months -- February, March, April, and May -- for sample selection; instrument design, drafting, field testing, and revision; and questionnaire distribution and faculty responses. Allowance also had to be made for the spring break and for tight faculty schedules during the period of final examinations and commencements. This study schedule placed significant pressure on the research design to limit the scope and complexity of the study sample and faculty questionnaires, so as to: (a) make it possible for the Advisory

Committee to respond quickly to drafts of the instruments; (b) minimize the burden on the segments for instrument field testing, distribution, follow-up, and collection; and (c) limit the amount of time respondents would need to complete the questionnaires, in order to secure the best possible response rates.

The time limitations inherent in the academic calendar imposed equally severe constraints on the schedule for conducting fieldwork visits, which had to be completed before mid-June at the latest (depending on campus schedules). Nor was there much relaxation of this pressure when it came to collecting campus-level survey data or information from the segments, since many administrators (though they work on a twelve-month basis) had plans to leave on vacation soon after the end of the academic year.

Finally, the design schedule was influenced by the need to allow time for the segments to enter large quantities of data, and provide data tapes to the study team, on a schedule that would allow sufficient time for analysis and report preparation by fall 1987, as called for in the study contract. Segment representatives were concerned, in this regard, that the schedule had to provide for the collection of completed faculty questionnaires at an early enough date to insure that campus or segment data processing personnel would still be available to enter the data and create the necessary data tapes (many of these technical people would not be available after the end of the academic year). They were also concerned that enough time be allowed for campus

administrators to collect the complex programmatic and expenditure data that would be asked for in the campus-level surveys, and for those data files to be created as well. Since it was also essential from the perspective of the study team that data be made available as early as possible, the research was designed to yield analysis-ready faculty-level data by the end of May, and campus-level data less than two weeks later.

B. THE FACULTY LEVEL ANALYSIS

1. Sampling And Weighting Procedures

Separate samples were chosen from the population of full-time teaching faculty members at each of California's public postsecondary education institutions. The approach to the sampling design for all three segments was the same, though the implementation was somewhat different at CCC than at UC or CSU. The sampling and data collection efforts took place over a four month period in 1987.

The Population and the Sample

The teaching faculty at each segment come from many different backgrounds, vary in their career positions, and are different in ways that might affect their participation in professional

development. In light of this wide variation, the study was designed to examine the amount and type of development activity for faculty of different rank, gender and ethnicity. By agreement with segmental representatives, we studied only full-time teaching faculty. The population figures used in this study for full-time teaching faculty were supplied by the segments, and represent the population in 1986-87. Before discussing the sample of faculty who participated in this study, we compare below the total number and type of full-time teaching faculty at each segment.

Table II.B.1 shows the distribution of teaching faculty across rank, gender and ethnicity for all three segments.

Faculty also teach and conduct research in different disciplinary areas. Tables II.B.2a, b, and c show the distribution of faculty across disciplines. As the tables indicate, the disciplinary areas differ across segments, and, in particular, the community colleges offer a somewhat different range of instructional areas than do the other segments. The disciplinary areas shown in these tables were developed by the segments.

It is also reasonable to suspect that faculty participation in development depends on the characteristics of the campuses. (We certainly found this to be true in our field work visits, as Volume II describes.)[25] Table II.B.3 demonstrates the large variation between and within segments in the size of the full-time teaching faculty by campus.

---

[25] Data were gathered by campus, but by agreement with the segments, data identifying individual campuses were not reported by the study.

TABLE II.B.1

RANK, GENDER AND ETHNICITY OF TEACHING FACULTY
(Number of Faculty in Each Full-Time Subgroup, and Percent of Total Population of Full-Time Teaching Faculty Represented by Subgroup)

	Teaching Faculty					
	UC		CSU		CCC[1]	
	#	% of Tot.[2]	#	% of Tot.	#	% of Tot.
Professors						
Female, White	298	5%	1100	11%	3595	25%
, Hispanic	10	<1%	32	<1%	232	2%
, Black	6	<1%	38	<1%	291	2%
, Asian	13	<1%	67	1%	226	2%
, Native Amer.	0	0%	2	<1%	24	<1%
Male , White	3456	55%	5457	52%	7818	55%
, Hispanic	90	1%	162	2%	473	3%
, Black	50	1%	119	1%	345	2%
, Asian	207	3%	418	4%	241	2%
, Native Amer.	10	<1%	25	<1%	54	<1%
Total Professors	4,140	66%	7,420	71%	13,299	93%
Assoc. Professors						
Female, White	242	4%	608	6%		
, Hispanic	15	<1%	28	<1%		
, Black	10	<1%	26	<1%		
, Asian	18	<1%	33	<1%		
, Native Amer.	2	<1%	7	<1%		
Male , White	798	13%	1251	12%		
, Hispanic	45	1%	78	1%		
, Black	34	1%	54	1%		
, Asian	52	1%	149	1%		
, Native Amer.	1	<1%	8	<1%		
Total Assoc. Professors	1,217	19%	2,242	21%		

[1]For CCC, tenured faculty are shown as Professors; probationary faculty as Assistant Professors.

[2]All percentages on this and subsequent tables are recorded to the nearest whole number.

TABLE II.B.1 (Cont.)

RANK, GENDER AND ETHNICITY OF TEACHING FACULTY
(Number of Faculty in Each Full-Time Subgroup, and Percent
of Total Population of Full-Time Teaching Faculty Represented by Subgroup)

	Teaching Faculty					
	UC		CSU		CCC[1]	
	#	% of Tot.[2]	#	% of Tot.	#	% of Tot.
Asst. Professors						
Female, White	237	4%	315	3%	368	3%
, Hispanic	23	<1%	16	<1%	21	<1%
, Black	12	<1%	11	<1%	26	<1%
, Asian	19	0%	18	<1%	18	<1%
, Native Amer.	0	0%	2	<1%	2	<1%
Male , White	512	8%	331	3%	430	<1%
, Hispanic	35	<1%	29	<1%	25	<1%
, Black	8	<1%	18	<1%	36	<1%
, Asian	69	1%	47	<1%	19	<1%
, Native Amer.	0	0	2	<1%	3	<1%
Total Asst. Professors	915	15%	789	8%	948	7%
TOTAL	6,272		10,451		14,247	

[1]For CCC, tenured faculty are shown as Professors; probationary faculty as Assistant Professors.

[2]All percentages on this and subsequent tables are recorded to the nearest whole number.

TABLE II.B.2a

DISCIPLINARY FOCUS OF FACULTY
By Gender and Ethnicity
UC, Excluding UCSF

Gender and Ethnicity	% of Faculty With a Disciplinary Specialty[1] in: Life & Phys. Sciences	Soc. Sci.	Fine Arts & Human.	Applied Life & Phys. Sci.	Applied Social Sciences
Female, White	7%	13%	18%	8%	18%
, Hispanic	<1%	1%	1%	<1%	2%
, Black	0%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%
, Asian	<1%	1%	1%	<1%	1%
, Native Amer.	0%	0%	<1%	0%	<1%
Male , White	85%	74%	71%	77%	69%
, Hispanic	1%	3%	4%	3%	3%
, Black	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%
, Asian	5%	4%	2%	11%	4%
, Native Amer.	<1%	<1%	<1%	0%	0%
TOTAL NUMBER IN SPECIALTY	1517	1126	1228	1312	627

[1] UC officials agreed to group the full-time teaching faculty into the above discipline categories. Librarians, non-instructional faculty or staff, lecturers or part-time faculty, and faculty at UCSF are excluded from the above.

TABLE II.B.2a.1

DISCIPLINARY FOCUS OF FACULTY
By Gender and Ethnicity
UC San Francisco

Gender and Ethnicity	% of Faculty With Disciplinary Specialty in Medicine	Dentistry	Nursing	Pharmacy
Female, White	9%	1%	84%	12%
, Hispanic	0%	1%	0%	2%
, Black	0%	0%	0%	0%
, Asian	<1%	1%	6%	4%
, Native Amer.	0%	0%	0%	0%
Male , White	84%	73%	8%	73%
, Hispanic	1%	3%	0%	2%
, Black	0%	3%	2%	0%
, Asian	4%	8%	0%	6%
, Native Amer.	<1%	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL NUMBER IN SPECIALTY	270	94	49	49

TABLE II.B.2b

DISCIPLINARY FOCUS OF FACULTY
By Gender and Ethnicity
CSU

Gender and Ethnicity	% of Faculty With a Disciplinary Specialty in: Life & Phys. Sciences	Soc. Sci.	Fine Arts & Human.	Applied Life & Phys. Sci.	Applied Social Sciences	Educ.
Female, White	10%	16%	23%	22%	19%	29%
, Hispanic	<1%	1%	1%	<1%	<1%	2%
, Black	<1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%
, Asian	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
, Native Amer.	0%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
Male , White	77%	69%	66%	32%	67%	58%
, Hispanic	1%	4%	3%	1%	2%	3%
, Black	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%
, Asian	8%	5%	2%	12%	7%	2%
, Native Amer.	<1%	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
TOTAL NUMBER IN SPECIALTY	1921	1946	2106	1192	1919	1377

TABLE II.B.2c

DISCIPLINARY FOCUS OF FACULTY
By Gender and Ethnicity
CCC

Gender and Ethnicity	% of Faculty With a Disciplinary Specialty in: Life & Phys. Sciences	Soc. Sci.	Fine Arts & Human.	Vocational	Basic Skills	Non-Credit/ Adult
Female, White	24%	19%	21%	34%	40%	46%
, Hispanic	<1%	2%	3%	2%	4%	5%
, Black	1%	2%	0%	3%	4%	6%
, Asian	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	6%
, Native Amer.	0%	0%	0%	<1%	<1%	0%
Male , White	67%	63%	62%	53%	35%	28%
, Hispanic	2%	5%	7%	3%	8%	4%
, Black	2%	5%	2%	3%	4%	2%
, Asian	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%
, Native Amer.	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
TOTAL NUMBER IN SPECIALTY	4860	1718	1739	4755	556	442

TABLE II.B.3

FULL-TIME TEACHING FACULTY BY CAMPUS

UC		CSU		CCC[1]	
1.	317	1.	158	1.	12
2.	426	2.	180	2.	21
3.	464	3.	221	3.	30
4.	503	4.	232	4.	54
5.	552	5.	252	5.	55
6.	676	6.	347	6.	60
7.	1036	7.	448	7.	88
8.	1393	8.	586	8.	96
9.	1612	9.	625	9.	100
		10.	638	10.	106
		11.	657	11.	111
		12.	668	12.	112
		13.	745	13.	131
		14.	771	14.	150
		15.	786	15.	163
		16.	809	16.	171
		17.	828	17.	182
		18.	848	18.	185
		19.	986	19.	214
				20.	217
				21.	269
				22.	291
				23.	301
				24.	315
				25.	395
				26.	403

[1] Study sample, FY 1985-86

These five variables -- rank, gender, ethnicity, discipline, and campus -- are so critical to exploring faculty development that they constituted the main considerations in our study sample design.

The principal goal of the sampling effort was to develop a sample that would provide accurate estimates of faculty development activity levels for each of the three segments. Sampling frames were developed at the campus level by segment. For UC and CSU, all 9 and 19 campuses, respectively, were included in their frames. Due to limited resources, it was not possible to include all 105 CCC campuses; instead, a representative sample of 26 campuses constituted the sampling frame (this campus sample was developed for CCC prior to this study).[26] These frames were stratified by gender, rank, and ethnicity. Female and minority faculty were over-sampled; as a result, female and minority faculty comprise a larger percentage of the respondent sample than they do in the population.

Table II.B.4 shows the sampling rates used for the three sampling frames.[27] As can be seen in the table, the sample called for all minority faculty members to be included, except for Asian males. At UC and CSU, Asian males were sampled at a 50 percent

---

26 The samples were developed for a 1981 study of the CCC Student Accountability Model conducted by Shirley McGillicuddy and Associates, and used successfully in other studies. See Berman, Weiler Associates, California Higher Education Staff Development Policy Study: Technical Proposal, Berkeley: November 12, 1986.

27 Samples were drawn independent of disciplinary areas, but each sample was checked to determine whether any systematic bias resulted in relationship to discipline.

TABLE II.B.4

SAMPLING RATES BY SEGMENT, RANK, GENDER, AND ETHNICITY

	UC	CSU	CCC[1]
Full Professor[2]/ Tenured Faculty			
Female, White	.50	.20	.50
Non-White	1.00	1.00	1.00
Male, White	.09	.05	.25
Asian	.50	.50	1.00
Other Minority	1.00	1.00	1.00
Associate Professor			
Female, White	.50	.25	N/A
Non-White	1.00	1.00	N/A
Male, White	.08	.13	N/A
Asian	.50	.50	N/A
Other Minority	1.00	1.00	N/A
Assistant Professor[3]/ Contract Faculty			
Female, White	1.00	1.00	1.00
Non-White	1.00	1.00	1.00
Male, White	.50	1.00	1.00
Asian	.50	1.00	1.00
Other Minority	1.00	1.00	1.00

1 CCC rates refer to CCC sampling frame and not to CCC population.

2 Full Professor rank at UC and CSU and Tenured Faculty rank at CCC.

3 Assistant Professor rank at UC and CSU and Non-Tenured Faculty rank at CCC.

rate, except for Asian male Assistant Professors at CSU, all of whom were included in the sample. Due to their large numbers, white male Professors had the lowest sampling rates.

Once the three samples were selected, the questionnaires were administered under the auspices of the respective segment administrations. Table II.B.5 shows the number of faculty who responded to our questionnaire, by segment, rank, gender, and ethnicity. The footnotes to this table show the response rates. These response rates differed across segments, rank, gender, and ethnicity, as Table II.B.5 shows.

Sample Biases and Analysis Weights

In order to yield unbiased results for a population, the stratified samples were analyzed typically in a weighted fashion.[28] A thorough analysis was conducted of several possible weighting schemes for each segment. These possible stratifications were based upon various combinations of rank, gender, ethnicity, and discipline. Also, we collapsed some categories across cells for some of these variables. By means of this analysis, it was determined that the same weighting procedure could be used for all three segments. The weighting procedure utilized a three-way stratification based upon rank, gender, and ethnicity.

---

[28] Some respondents did not provide sufficient information about their ethnicity, gender or rank for weighting purposes. Since their questionnaire data could not be analyzed without analysis weights, they were treated as nonrespondents.

TABLE II.B.5

THE RESPONDING SAMPLE OF FACULTY BY RANK, GENDER AND ETHNICITY
(Number of Respondents in Each Subgroup, and Percent of
Total Sample Represented by Those Respondents)

	Faculty in the Sample					
	UC		CSU		CCC[1]	
	#	% of Tot.	#	% of Tot.	#	% of Tot.
Professors						
Female, White	77	10%	164	9%	264	30%
, Hispanic	4	1%	23	1%	26	3%
, Black	1	<1%	22	1%	25	2%
, Asian	2	<1%	45	2%	28	2%
, Native Amer.	0	0%	4	<1%	4	<1%
Male , White	149	20%	230	12%	268	34%
, Hispanic	24	3%	74	4%	40	4%
, Black	13	2%	62	3%	29	4%
, Asian	46	6%	121	7%	31	4%
, Native Amer.	0	0%	14	1%	9	1%
Total Professors	316	43%	759	40%	724	84%
Assoc. Professors						
Female, White	57	8%	148	8%		
, Hispanic	7	1%	12	1%		
, Black	4	1%	12	1%		
, Asian	2	<1%	22	1%		
, Native Amer.	1	<1%	4	<1%		
Male , White	33	4%	133	7%		
, Hispanic	11	1%	38	2%		
, Black	6	1%	32	2%		
, Asian	11	1%	52	3%		
, Native Amer.	1	<1%	7	<1%		
Total Assoc. Professors	133	17%	460	25%		

[1] CCC tenured faculty are listed as Professors; probationary faculty are listed as Assistant Professors.

TABLE II.B.5 (Cont.)

THE RESPONDING SAMPLE OF FACULTY BY RANK, GENDER AND ETHNICITY
(Number of Respondents in Each Subgroup, and Percent of
Total Sample Represented by Those Respondents)

	Faculty in the Sample					
	UC		CSU		CCC	
	#	% of Tot.	#	% of Tot.	#	% of Tot.
Asst. Professors						
Female, White	99	13%	279	15%	68	8%
, Hispanic	4	1%	12	1%	2	<1%
, Black	2	<1%	12	1%	3	<1%
, Asian	6	1%	17	1%	9	1%
, Native Amer.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Male , White	133	18%	243	13%	54	5%
, Hispanic	12	2%	15	1%	3	<1%
, Black	3	<1%	14	1%	4	<1%
, Asian	34	5%	31	2%	5	1%
, Native Amer.	0	0%	3	<1%	2	<1%
Total Asst. Professors	293	40%	626	35%	150	16%
TOTAL	742[1]	100%	1,845[2]	100%	874[3]	100%

[1] At UC, 1646 faculty were sent questionnaires, and 49% (806) of these responded. However, 64 of the returned questionnaires did not include the requested information on ethnicity or gender, and these data were excluded from analysis.

[2] At CSU, 2738 faculty were sent questionnaires, and 87% (2394) of these responded. However, 421 of these were lecturers or non-full time teachers, and 128 of the returned questionnaires did not include information on ethnicity or gender; these data were excluded from analysis.

[3] At CCC, 1568 faculty were sent questionnaires; 60% (948) responded. However, 74 questionnaires lacked information on gender or ethnicity; these data were excluded from analysis.

For each respondent who supplied information on these three variables, an analysis weight was computed. This weight was obtained as the ratio of the appropriate cell frequency in Table II.B.1 (the population frequency) to the corresponding cell frequency in Table II.B.4 (the sampling rates). These weights compensated for the three major known biases (when compared to the population) introduced into the sample by the stratified sampling plan. These biases were direct consequences of intentional oversampling of female and minority faculty.

2. Faculty Questionnaire Development and Administration

The Questionnaire Development Process

Development of the faculty questionnaires followed a ten step process:

1. Review of the research literature on faculty development, in order to sharpen the study team's understanding of key issues and develop an initial list of development activities to be asked about in the questionnaire.

2. Discussions with segment personnel, to agree on what types of faculty members were to be included in the sample and hear segment views on topic areas or questions they would like to exclude or include (both subjects are discussed further below); to familiarize the instrument designers with terminology used by the segments when describing faculty development; and to discuss the types of knowledge that faculty members might have about such matters as the purposes and funding for their development activities.

3. Exploratory fieldwork on campuses at each segment, to learn more about the range of development activities

undertaken by faculty, and what faculty might be expected to know about those activities.

4. Preparation of draft instruments, tailored to faculty at each segment. A variation on the UC faculty questionnaire was also prepared for the medical school faculty at UC San Francisco.

5. Advisory Committee review of the draft questionnaires with suggestions for substantive and format refinements.

6. Revision of the draft questionnaires in response to suggestions made by Advisory Committee members.

7. Field tests of the revised instruments conducted by each segment with selected faculty who were asked to complete the questionnaires, and comment on the extent to which they found the instruments easy to understand and answer.

8. Instrument revision in response to information gained from the field test.

9. Further instrument review by committees of the UC and CSU Academic Senate, and suggestions for additional refinements.

10. Final revision of the questionnaires and transmittal to each segment for reproduction and administration.

At an early point in this process (see Step 2, above), agreements were reached with the segments and CPEC staff on the nature of the faculty respondents to be sampled, on limitations and exclusions in questionnaire coverage, and on ways in which to define disciplinary areas for purposes of sampling and analysis.

Respondents to be Sampled

Constraints on study time and resources made it necessary to focus on a faculty sample that would be most likely to yield the policy-relevant information desired, since attempting to do too much could endanger the effort to capture essential data. This

meant excluding from the sample faculty who had a low likelihood of participating in development activities, or did not ordinarily spend much time teaching undergraduates. It also meant excluding from the sample a wide variety of administrative and support staff at each segment. Section II.A., above, summarizes the agreements that were reached with regard to these issues.

Limitations and Exclusions

Because the University of California excluded research-related activities from its definition of faculty development, it was agreed that UC faculty would not be asked any questions about their research-related activities, including the conduct or dissemination of research, activities designed to sharpen research skills, or scholarly activities designed to help faculty stay up to date in their disciplinary areas.

The University of California also requested that UC faculty not be asked to report on the number of hours they spent per week teaching undergraduate classes. This question was dropped from the faculty questionnaires for all three segments.

Definitions of Disciplinary Areas

As previously noted, the faculty sample was to be drawn by faculty area of specialization as well as by gender, ethnicity, and rank. Since there are a great many disciplinary specialties spread at each segment, it was agreed that the sample would be selected according to a small number of broad disciplinary areas,

each of which embraced a number of specialties. Each segment would then define the specialties that fell within each broad disciplinary area, in order to provide to the study team the number of full-time teaching faculty in each area. The disciplinary areas agreed to were as follows:

University of California

Life and Physical Sciences
Social Sciences
Fine Arts and Humanities
Applied Life and Physical Sciences
Applied Social Sciences

California State University

Life and Physical Sciences
Social Sciences
Fine Arts and Humanities
Applied Life and Physical Sciences
Applied Social Sciences
Education

California Community Colleges

Life and Physical Sciences
Social Sciences
Fine Arts and Humanities
Occupational Education
Vocational Education
Basic Skills and Remedial Education

Questionnaire Administration

Under the terms of the study contract awarded by CPEC, the segments were responsible for collecting all questionnaire and survey data and providing computer-readable analysis tapes to the contractor in a format the contractor would specify. CPEC signed agreements with each segment that outlined these responsibilities, provided funding assistance for these tasks, and specified limited

monetary penalties if clean data were not delivered to the contractor on time. In implementing these agreements, the segments took the following steps:

1. Identified the faculty in the sample, according to a sampling algorithm provided by BW (discussed above).

2. Reproduced enough copies of the faculty questionnaire for distribution to the faculty sample, from a reproducible provided by BW.

3. Distributed the questionnaire and covering instructions to the faculty sample, through campus study liaison administrators.

4. Sent follow-up reminder letters to the faculty sample in order to obtain the best possible response rate.

5. Obtained completed questionnaires from a sample of "non-responding" faculty (discussed below in more detail).

6. Collected completed questionnaires from faculty, entered questionnaire data on computer tape in a format specified by BW, and delivered the tapes to BW.[29]

The Non-respondent sample. In order to estimate the reliability of survey responses, it was necessary to know if those faculty who did not respond would have given different answers than those who did. In order to obtain this information, each campus was instructed to retrieve completed surveys from a small sample of non-respondents. The following procedures were observed by each campus:

- Surveys were distributed to the faculty sample.

---

[29] Data entry was handled at the segment level by UC and CCC, and initially decentralized to the campus level by CSU. When a number of CSU campuses began to have technical difficulties accomplishing this task in a timely manner, CSU and BW agreed that the campuses would mail the completed questionnaires to BW, who would arrange for data entry and creation of the analysis tape.

- Callbacks were made in order to achieve the best possible response rates.

- A date was specified for "closing the window" -- after which anyone who had not returned a completed survey was "officially" a non-respondent.

- Campuses reported to their segment offices the total number of faculty in their samples who were non-respondents, and the number of non-responding female and minority faculty.

- The segment offices reported to BW the non-response rates for their systems, and the system-wide proportion of female and minority non-respondents.

- BW determined the number of non-respondents system-wide who should be asked to complete the survey in order to obtain the information needed about the characteristics of the non-respondents.

- BW instructed each system on how to have the campuses sample non-respondents. The samples were quota samples, in which the samples were complete when the required number of non-respondents at each campus were reached.

- The systems asked each campus to secure completed surveys from the proportion of the total non-respondent sample equal to that campus' proportion of the total sample (meaning that no campus had more than a few individuals to contact).

- Each campus made personal contact with the necessary number of non-respondents in order to secure completed surveys, and added the data from these surveys to the data file it was preparing, coded as the non-response sample.

- Completed questionnaires that were returned to campus officials after the date on which the "window had closed," but were not from faculty who were part of the non-respondent sample, were treated as questionnaires from respondents, and included in the data base where time permitted.

C. THE CAMPUS LEVEL ANALYSIS

1. CCC Campus Survey II Population and Sample

CCC Campus Survey I was sent to a sample of 26 colleges. Because only 13 colleges responded, it was not possible to make reliable estimates of community college expenditures, or general statements about needs as viewed by campus administrators. Campus Survey II was therefore sent to all 105 community colleges; it requested information restricted to these two categories. Sixty-four colleges responded to Campus Survey II; these colleges were adequately representative of all the community colleges on the key dimensions of college ADA, metropolitan status, full- and part-time faculty FTE, and operating expenditures.

The 64 colleges comprising the Campus Survey II "sample" were compared to all community colleges using data supplied by the Office of the Chancellor. These comparisons are shown below.

ADA

The average student ADA for all 105 community colleges in FY 1985-86 (the fiscal year covered by the survey) was 6,324; the average student ADA for the sample colleges was 6,371. The Office of the Chancellor also categorizes each college as large, medium, or small; the comparison of the population to the sample according to this categorization is:

	Population	Sample
Small	33%	30%
Medium	42%	40%
Large	25%	30%

Metropolitan Status

The Office of the Chancellor characterizes each college according to whether it serves a predominantly urban, rural, or suburban population. The comparison of the population to the sample according to this characterization is:

	Population	Sample
Urban	17%	15%
Rural	33%	33%
Suburban	50%	52%

Faculty FTE

The average full-time faculty FTE for all 105 community colleges was 145; for the 64 sample colleges it was 149. The average part-time faculty FTE for all colleges was 67; for the sample colleges it was 68.

Operating Expenditures

Operating expenditures are available from the Office of the Chancellor at the district level only. For this comparison, therefore, all multiple-college districts were excluded. Average district operating expenditures for all 52 single college districts were $18,670,000 in FY 1985-86. For the 34 single

college districts in the Campus Survey II sample, average operating expenditures in FY 1985-86 were $19,615,000.

2. Campus Survey Development and Administration

The Survey Development Process

Development of the campus surveys followed a ten step process:

1. Review of the research and descriptive literature on faculty development, in order to help develop questions and guidelines for survey respondents about programs and activities sponsored by colleges and universities.

2. Discussions with segment personnel, to gain additional knowledge about segment development programs and activities; to review what kinds and levels of information campus administrators would have access to; and to hear segment views on topics that should be included or excluded from the survey (discussed below).

3. Exploratory fieldwork on campuses at each segment, to learn more about the kinds of programs and activities sponsored by campuses (see also Section II.B.2).

4. Preparation of draft instruments, tailored to each segment.

5. Advisory Committee review of the draft survey instruments, with suggestions for substantive and format refinements.

6. Revision of the draft survey instruments in response to suggestions made by Advisory Committee members.

7. Review of the revised instruments by campus representatives from each segment. Separate meetings were held with representatives from the majority of UC and CSU campuses, and with representatives from fourteen of the twenty-six community colleges in the study sample. At each meeting, the draft survey instruments were reviewed to insure that the concepts and language used were consistent with campus practices, and that campus

officials would be able to generate the information being requested.

8. Revision of the survey instruments in light of information developed at the meetings with campus representatives.

9. Advisory Committee Review of the revised instruments.

10. Final revision of the instruments in response to Advisory Committee suggestions, and transmittal to each segment for reproduction and administration.

The meetings with segment and campus representatives and feedback from the Advisory Committee led to a number of understandings about how the campus surveys would be structured:

1. Due to wide variation among campuses in recordkeeping practices and access to information, the survey would ask only for summary information in key categories, and would generally limit the amount of detail requested, particularly in the area of expenditures.

2. In requesting information on expenditures (e.g., on sources of funding), the survey would use each segment's unique accounting categories, rather than attempt to frame uniform categories across segments.

3. Faculty affirmative action development activities would be treated as a separate category. Information on affirmative action programs and expenditures would be requested and reported on in addition to, rather than as part of, information on all other programs and program expenditures.

4. No questions pertaining to research-related development programs, activities or expenditures would be asked at the University of California (see also Section II.B.2).

5. At the request of UC system-wide officials, no questions about development needs from the perspective of campus administrations would be asked on the UC surveys. These questions were included in the surveys for CSU and CCC only.

Survey Administration

As noted previously, the segments were responsible for collecting all questionnaire and survey data and providing computer-readable analysis tapes to the contractor. Accordingly, the segments took the following steps to administer the campus surveys:

1. Copies of the survey were reproduced and distributed by the segments to their campuses.

2. Campus officials reproduced the survey for distribution to sub-campus administrative centers from which they needed information.

3. Campus study liaison administrators worked with campus budget officials and other administrators in order to complete the survey instrument for each of their campuses.

4. Segment officials followed up with campus liaisons to make sure the work would be completed on time, and independently provided information to BW on segment-sponsored development programs and segment expenditures.

5. Completed surveys were sent by campuses to their segment offices, where the data were entered on computer tape and sent to BW.[30]

CCC Campus Survey II. As noted above, it was decided to send Campus Survey II to all community college after only thirteen of twenty-six colleges in the CCC sample completed the campus surveys described above. In preparation for the administration of CCC Campus Survey II, an informal group of community college CEO's and organizational leaders made contact with virtually all community

---

[30] As in the case of the faculty questionnaire, CSU campus surveys were sent directly to BW, where the data were entered and a computer analysis file was created.

college presidents, either directly or at various organizational meetings that had already been scheduled, to inform them of the importance of providing data for the study, and asking for their cooperation. The survey was reproduced by the CCC Office of the Chancellor, and sent to the colleges under a cover letter from the Interim Chancellor and the Executive Director of CPEC. This was an "eleventh hour" attempt to secure enough data to allow reliable expenditure estimates for the community colleges (and reliable statements about campus' views of their needs), and the survey was restricted to a small number of straightforward questions on these topics. The colleges were asked to respond within eight days, and the majority did so, as described above.

3. Approach to Estimating Expenditures

Three considerations influenced the study's approach to estimating segmental expenditures for faculty development:

1. The information must be useful to policy-makers. In particular, it should highlight the extent to which the segments use state funds to support faculty development rather than competing objectives.

2. The segments differ in key respects in their definitions of faculty development; analyses of segmental expenditures must account for these differences.

3. Measurements of expenditures are susceptible to error due to inherent methodological complexities. Campus budget records, for example, are not ordinarily organized in a way that permits ready identification of faculty development activities.

These issues are discussed below.

Policy-Relevant Information

State policymakers seek information that could help them decide how to respond to segmental requests for funding faculty development. In particular, policymakers want to know how much state money is already being spent on these activities, and what the state spends on their behalf compared to state spending in support of other programs in higher education. There are two ways in which this question could be answered. First, the total cost of faculty development could be estimated for each segment. This figure would be an approximate measure of the value of all resources committed to faculty development activities. It would include all direct expenditures; the dollar value of time spent by faculty, administrators, and support staff on development activities; and relevant overhead costs such as facilities and maintenance. (Cost data in the latter category would be extremely difficult for segment or campus personnel to estimate.) The study has collected data on faculty time spent on development activities, as well as relevant salary information. These data could yield an estimate of the cost of faculty time spent on development, and, when combined with expenditure data, an approximation of the "total cost" of faculty development at each segment. This figure, however, would not be a sound guide to state policy decisions, since it would include costs (i.e., faculty time) incurred by the segments whether or not faculty

development activities take place. In this respect, for example, California higher education institutions differ markedly from the elementary/secondary system. In the K-12 schools, teacher salaries are predicated on a fixed amount of time to be spent on the job; additional time spent in faculty development activities (e.g., attending weekend workshops or evening courses) is paid for in addition to basic salaries, and then becomes an extra cost to the system. College and university instructors, on the other hand, receive no additional compensation for such activities; their work weeks are "expandable" to accommodate the extra time spent.[31]

A different approach to estimating faculty development costs is more likely to yield information that is directly relevant to policy decisions. Rather than report on the approximate value of all development activities, including the value of faculty time, an estimate can be made of campus- and system-level expenditures

---

[31] Some K-12 faculty development takes place during school time. Classes are dismissed early and teachers spend the time in development activities. Except for expenditures that may be made for outside speakers or discussion leaders, refreshments, etc. on these occasions, these programs do not represent an incremental cost to school districts, since their teachers are being paid the same amount whether they teach or participate in faculty development on those days. Similarly, the community colleges may elect to participate in a "flexible calendar" program that permits a college to reduce its 175 day academic year by up to 15 days (with no loss of state ADA support), in order to provide development activities for college faculty.

The community colleges resemble the K-12 system in one other respect: Most community college faculty may increase their salaries by successfully completing units of higher education course credit beyond the level of their earned degree. These salary increments do represent an extra cost to their districts, and are reported on in Volume II.

made specifically for faculty development. These are incremental expenditures -- those made in addition to expenditures for other purposes. They represent monies that could be committed to other uses -- or not spent at all. Information collected on the sources of revenue used for these expenditures can reveal what fraction is paid for by state budget allocations and other state sources, and provide a picture of the marginal cost to the state of supporting faculty development in higher education. The study reports incremental expenditure figures useful for policy considerations.

Segmental Differences

As noted earlier and in Volume II, the segments do not share a common definition of faculty development, and have different development priorities arising out of their distinct missions and histories. These differences must be taken into account in order to provide a balanced portrait of activities and expenditures.

The University of California is designated by the state as the primary segment for the conduct of research. Faculty time used for research or scholarship (e.g., keeping current in a discipline or field) is considered a normal faculty responsibility in keeping with this mission, and is not treated as faculty development. UC reports on faculty development expenditures do not include any expenditures for research or scholarship; they are restricted to programs for helping faculty improve instructional, assessment and advising skills, or develop curriculum.

The primary mission of the California State University is undergraduate and graduate instruction through the Master's degree, with research authorized where it is consistent with this function. The reality, as we have noted elsewhere, is that many departments at most campuses in the CSU system require their faculty to conduct and publish research as a condition for obtaining tenure and promotion, and all faculty are expected to remain current in their fields.[32] Because instruction is officially the faculty's main function, CSU considers faculty development to include support for research and scholarship as well as assistance with instruction, advising, assessment, and curriculum. Therefore, incremental expenditures reported by CSU cover research-related activities.

Though California Community College faculty are not required to conduct and publish research, they are expected to stay current in their fields, and to improve their teaching, assessment, advising, and curriculum development skills. Research is, however, considered a legitimate means for maintaining currency, and its support is treated as a form of faculty development, together with support for other forms of scholarship and the improvement of teaching and related skills. Thus, the CCC definition of professional development is similar to that of CSU,

---

[32] A few of the smaller campuses remain primarily "teaching" institutions, but from the perspective of the average faculty member CSU feels very much like "UC plus a heavy teaching load."

and incremental expenditures reported by CCC also include research-related activities.

Methodological Issues

The estimation of faculty development expenditures is subject to a number of methodological complexities:

- Faculty development is a pervasive activity at college and university campuses, and is often not susceptible to separate measurement.
- Campus administrators are often unaware of activities that take place under school, department, or other auspices, and may therefore omit some programs when reporting on faculty development.
- Faculty development is a complex activity, and pertinent records are often unavailable, incomplete, or confounded with records kept for other purposes.
- Faculty development is not always a clear and well-defined activity. Administrators may label activities as faculty development when they are not, or categorize activities incorrectly.

Each of these issues is discussed briefly below.

Pervasiveness. In its broadest sense, faculty development refers to activities that increase faculty knowledge and skills -- that help them grow as professionals. Many of these activities are simply part of the fabric of the normal work day for the average faculty member. Conversations with colleagues, informal department colloquia or seminars, the ordering of ideas in preparation for teaching a class -- all can contribute in small or large ways to professional growth. Few of these activities can be "measured" in any formal sense, and many faculty members do not

think of them as "development" activities at all. Thus, the study's approach of estimating incremental expenditures only must necessarily understate the true pervasiveness and scope of faculty development in higher education.

Errors of omission. On large university and college campuses, the sheer scale of faculty activities makes it almost impossible for any given administrative office to keep track of all faculty development. Moreover, many programs are decentralized -- supported by schools, colleges, and departments, or offered to individual faculty by ancillary campus service units (e.g.,computer, media, or resource centers). They exist, not as the result of a campus-wide plan, but as clusters of activities engaged in by faculty as opportunity and convenience permit. Inventories of faculty development, and associated estimates of expenditures, that are centrally collected (as was necessary in this study) are therefore subject to errors of omission -- a failure to include some programs and activities that were simply overlooked by campus or even department administrators.

Gaps in record-keeping. In general, college and university financial records are not designed to yield data on faculty development, since these programs are rarely pulled together as a separate spending category for campus administrative review. Because development activities are complex and decentralized, a wide variety of different administrative centers maintain

pertinent records, and a campus "survey" of expenditures may miss some records that should be included.[33] Moreover, financial records may display expenses for standard budget categories such as salaries, fees, travel, etc., but provide little guidance as to what fraction of the expenditures in each category should be allocated for faculty development activities. Campus reports based on such records will provide, at best, a rough estimate of overall expenditures. Finally, colleges, schools, and departments -- particularly at UC -- have discretionary funds, and no central records are kept of how these funds are allocated to faculty development. It was beyond the study's scope to attempt to collect subcompass expenditure data (except for information available from the faculty questionnaire).

Errors of assignment. Many people agree on the meaning of faculty development as a general concept, but disagree on how to apply that concept to specific activities. The problem is not just one of semantics, or of conceptual poverty. The reality is that the boundary between faculty development and other professional activities is often hard to distinguish, and categories created for the convenience of description and classification often fail to capture the fluid and complex nature of these

---

[33] An Associate Dean at one campus wrote that she had asked for information from the records of eight schools, the campus instructional resource center, the center for information systems and computing, and offices responsible for personnel, graduate studies and research, undergraduate studies, and educational planning and resources.

activities. We found substantial differences of understanding among university faculty and administrators about what constitutes faculty development activity, and how to classify that activity (e.g., as related to research, instruction, curriculum, etc.). Some differences in understanding were ameliorated by detailed instructions included with the study survey forms, and discussions with campus administrators (described in more detail in Sections II.A and II.C.2). But these steps could not eliminate all possible sources of confusion, doubt, or varying interpretation.

As the preceding discussion suggests, there are significant differences among campuses in the completeness and accuracy of expenditure estimates for faculty development. Because of these differences, and because there is ample evidence that many campus estimates are likely to be quite rough, Volume II reports incremental expenditure estimates at the system level, which helps to average out individual campus errors. While these estimates are necessarily still crude, they are consistent with the objectives of an exploratory study, and should provide adequate guidance for broad policy decisions when examined in conjunction with other information provided in the report.

III. STATISTICAL ESTIMATES

This section provides a statistical context within which to interpret the key findings of the study, presented in Volumes I and II. A series of analyses were conducted to estimate three possible sources of variation that could influence the findings:

A. Inter-subject variation -- possible variation in responses associated with the measurement of key concepts through a sample of the population.

B. Non-response bias -- possible biases in the findings stemming from the failure of some faculty in the sample to respond to the faculty questionnaire.

C. Gender and rank biases -- possible biases in the findings stemming from different patterns of participation in development activities on the part of faculty of different gender and rank.

The results of these analyses are discussed below.

A. INTER-SUBJECT VARIATION

The study used the weighted sample means variables as the best estimates of all segment-level means, proportions, and percentages. Because a segment-level proportion is the mean of an indicator (i.e., a 0-1 variable), it can be estimated as the weighted sample mean of the analogous sample variable. Similarly, a segment-level percentage is simply 100 times the corresponding segment-level proportion. Thus, it can also be estimated with a weighted sample mean. Finally, due to different numbers of

respondents per questionnaire item, the sample means were calculated over varying numbers of respondents.

The findings associated with the samples can misrepresent the population in a variety of ways relating to the variance around the response categories and errors stemming from aggregating sample responses. The analysis was concerned in particular with possible sampling errors in findings related to two key study concepts: 1) the proportion of faculty who participated in development activities, and 2) the amount of time devoted by faculty to development activities.

Standard error terms, based on a 95% confidence interval, were calculated to estimate the sampling error.[34] The analyses revealed that small error terms were associated with the measurement of participation in faculty development (i.e.,the average number of faculty who reported they engaged in faculty development activities), for all three segments. The error terms were particularly small for the CSU sample because of the large numbers of respondents.

---

[34] Variances were estimated with the same data that were used to estimate the means. Each variance was estimated using the standard formula for the variance of a weighted mean under the assumption of homoscedasticity across weighing strata. This formula is slightly conservative in our case because it allows a contribution to the overall variance by respondents in sampling cells with a 100 percent response rate. The variance formula used was:

$$\text{Variance} = \frac{\text{sum of squared weights}}{(\text{sum of weights})^2} \times \text{Var(of a single obs)}$$

where Var (of a single obs) is the weighted sample variance.

Of necessity, there was greater variation associated with reported amounts of time devoted to faculty development; there is inherently more variation in the amount of time spent in development activities than in the decision whether or not to participate. Thus, when faculty reported that they engaged in private study, or enrolled in courses, they were reporting on clusters of activities, and within each cluster there were undoubtedly wide variations in the amount of time required by the activities in question. Error terms reported for the amount of time devoted to development therefore reflect these sources of response variation more than sampling errors. Moreover, only those respondents who participated in a given development activity were asked about the time they spent on the activity. Consequently, the number of such respondents was less than the responding sample n, and the standard error is expected to be greater.

Tables III.1 through III.12 present the error terms and associated 95% confidence intervals for the measurement of mean faculty participation in development activities and faculty time spent on development.[35] The data reported in the tables, even taking into account the variation in responses within a category, appear to support the findings as reported in Volumes I and II.

---

[35] For ease of reference, each table is footnoted to its counterpart in Volume II.

TABLE III.1

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATES OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Broad Measures, Instruction-Related Development Only
UC[1]

	SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
% of Faculty Reporting Some Form of Development Activity	65%	2.0 %	60%	70%
Average Hours Per Year Per Participating Faculty Member Devoted to Development Activity	134	33.7 %	68	200
Average Hours Worked Per Week	60[2]			
Average Proportion of Work Year Spent on Faculty Development if Faculty Work 44 Weeks Per Year[3]	.05	.01%	.02	.08

[1] See Volume II, Table IV.7

[2] According to official UC documents, the faculty work week is 60 hours (see Chapter III.B). UC officials denied a request to include a question on the faculty questionnaire asking respondents about their average work week.

[3] The number of weeks in a work year is an arbitrary assumption used only for the purpose of placing professional development hours into a year's context.

TABLE III.2

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATES OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Broad Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CSU[1]

	SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
% of Faculty Reporting Some Form of Development Activity	95%	1.0 %	93%	97%
Average Hours Per Year Per Participating Faculty Member Devoted to Development Activity	259	26.3 %	210	313
Average Hours Worked Per Week	49	1.2 %	46.6	51.4
Average Proportion of Work Year Spent on Faculty Development if Faculty Work 44 Weeks Per Year[2]	.12	.01%	.11	.17

[1] See Volume II, Table V.7

[2] The number of weeks in a work year is an arbitrary assumption used only for the purpose of placing professional development hours into a year's context.

TABLE III.3

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATES OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Broad Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CCC[1]

	SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
% of Faculty Reporting Some Form of Development Activity	93%	1.0 %	91%	95%
Average Hours Per Year Per Participating Faculty Member Devoted to Development Activity	183	46.0 %	92	273
Average Hours Worked Per Week	41	3.0 %	35	46
Average Proportion of Work Year Spent on Faculty Development if Faculty Work 44 Weeks Per Year[2]	.10	.02%	.10	.17

[1] See Volume II, Table VI.6

[2] The number of weeks in a work year is an arbitrary assumption used only for the purpose of placing professional development hours into a year's context.

TABLE III.4

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Specific Activities, Instruction-Related Development Only
UC[1]

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Development Activity: SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
Videotaping of Own Teaching	6%	1%	4%	8%
Observation of Peer's Classes	20%	2%	16%	24%
Direct Assistance from Faculty Development Specialists	7%	1%	4%	9%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	5%	1%	2%	7%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	1%	1%	0%	2%
Studying Specialized Faculty Development Materials (e.g., articles, training videos)	36%	3%	31%	41%
Developing, Preparing and/or Teaching Experimental or New Courses and Curricula	33%	2%	28%	38%
Attending On-Campus Course for Faculty Development	6%	1%	3%	8%
Attending Off-Campus Course for Faculty Development	3%	1%	2%	5%
Participating in On-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	14%	2%	10%	18%
Participating in Off-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	19%	2%	15%	23%
Attending Summer Institute	2%	1%	1%	3%
Other	7%	1%	4%	10%

[1] See Volume II, Table IV.8

TABLE III.5

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Specific Activities, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CSU[1]

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Development Activity			
	SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
Videotaping of Own Teaching	13%	1%	10%	15%
Observation of Peer's Classes	18%	1%	15%	21%
Direct Assistance from Faculty Development Specialists	13%	1%	11%	16%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	11%	1%	8%	13%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	6%	1%	4%	8%
Studying Specialized Faculty Development Materials (e.g., articles, training videos)	51%	2%	47%	55%
Developing, Preparing and/or Teaching Experimental or New Courses and Curricula	51%	2%	47%	55%
Attending On-Campus Course for Faculty Development	16%	1%	13%	19%
Attending Off-Campus Course for Faculty Development	19%	1%	16%	21%
Participating in On-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	48%	2%	45%	52%
Participating in Off-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	74%	2%	71%	77%
Attending Summer Institute	7%	1%	5%	9%
Other	17%	1%	14%	20%

[1] See Volume II, Table V.8

TABLE III.6

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Specific Activities, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CCC[1]

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Development Activity			
	SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
Videotaping of Own Teaching	14%	2%	11%	17%
Observation of Peer's Classes	26%	2%	23%	30%
Direct Assistance from Faculty Development Specialists	17%	2%	14%	20%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	8%	1%	6%	10%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	6%	1%	4%	8%
Studying Specialized Faculty Development Materials (e.g., articles, training videos)	65%	2%	61%	69%
Developing, Preparing and/or Teaching Experimental or New Courses and Curricula	50%	2%	45%	54%
Attending On-Campus Course for Faculty Development	20%	2%	16%	23%
Attending Off-Campus Course for Faculty Development	30%	2%	26%	34%
Participating in On-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	49%	2%	44%	53%
Participating in Off-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Fac. Devel.	69%	2%	68%	76%
Attending Summer Institute	9%	1%	6%	11%
Other	12%	1%	9%	15%

[1] See Volume II, Table VI.7

TABLE III.7

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction-Related Development Only
UC[1]

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Development Activity: SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
No Faculty Development Activity	35%	2%	30%	40%
Only Engaged in Private-Study	18%	2%	14%	22%
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc. and/or Engaged in Private-Study	10%	2%	7%	13%
Only Participated in Program. Activity	21%	2%	16%	24%
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private Study	16%	2%	13%	20%
	100%			

[1] See Volume II, Table IV.9

TABLE III.8

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction-and Research-Related Development
CSU[1]

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Development Activity: SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
No Faculty Development Activity	5%	1%	3%	7%
Only Engaged in Private-Study	5%	1%	3%	6%
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc. and/or Engaged in Private-Study	31%	2%	28%	35%
Only Participated in Program. Activity	8%	1%	6%	10%
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private Study	51%	2%	47%	54%
	100%			

[1] See Volume II, Table V.9

TABLE III.9

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CCC[1]

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Development Activity: SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
No Faculty Development Activity	7%	1%	5%	9%
Only Engaged in Private-Study	5%	1%	3%	7%
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc. and/or Engaged in Private-Study	25%	2%	21%	28%
Only Participated in Program. Activity	5%	1%	3%	7%
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private Study	58%	2%	54%	62%
	100%			

[1] See Volume II, Table VI.8

TABLE III.10

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATED FACULTY TIME SPENT ON DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction-Related Development Only
UC[1]

Type of Activity	Average Number of Hours Per Year of Development Activity for Participating Faculty			
	SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
Only Engaged in Private-Study	131	65.3%	2.5	258.6
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc.	30	27.8%	-21.8	87.1
Only Attended Conferences and Private-Study	231	93.8%	17.2	384.9
Only Participated in Program. Activity	114	55.7%	4.5	222.8
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private-Study	173	75.4%	22.6	318.1

[1] See Volume II, Table IV.10

TABLE III.11

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATED FACULTY TIME SPENT ON DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CSU[1]

Type of Activity	Average Number of Hours Per Year of Development Activity for Participating Faculty: SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
Only Engaged in Private-Study	202	105.1%	-10.9	401.2
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc.	66	15.8%	21.4	83.5
Only Attended Conferences and Private-Study	258	53.3%	142.5	351.6
Only Participated in Program. Activity	224	88.4%	48.9	395.2
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private-Study	317	38.1%	256.1	397.4

[1] See Volume II, Table V.10

TABLE III.12

STANDARD ERRORS FOR
ESTIMATED FACULTY TIME SPENT ON DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CCC[1]

Type of Activity	Average Number of Hours Per Year of Development Activity for Participating Faculty: SAMPLE MEAN	STD ERROR	95% Confid. Interval HIGH	LOW
Only Engaged in Private-Study	190	257.3%	-321.5	687.1
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc.	40	17.7%	-5.2	69.2
Only Attended Conferences and Private-Study	169	94.6%	-31.6	339.4
Only Participated in Program. Activity	275	239.5%	-207.4	731.3
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private-Study	201	58.3%	92.1	321.8

[1] See Volume II, Table VI.9

B. NON-RESPONSE BIAS

To assess potential errors stemming from incomplete responses from the selected faculty sample, a follow-up study of non-respondents was conducted. As discussed above in Section II.B.2, a small proportion of the faculty sample in each segment who had not returned completed questionnaires by a specified date were again asked to complete and return questionnaires. The completed instruments from this group were then analyzed in order to ascertain whether differences in their responses were great enough to suggest possible biases in our reported measures based on the responding sample. These analyses were confined primarily to the UC system, since there were very few CSU non-respondents, and CCC did not provide adequate non-respondent data.

Analysis first centered on rates of participation by rank and gender. Results suggest that females at the Assistant Professor level might have participated less than stated in the findings ($p \leq .07$, Chi Square with 4df = 8.56 on an n of 13). There were no statistically significant findings for faculty at other ranks. Table III.13 presents the data from this analysis (note the small non-response sample sizes).

Looking then at patterns of participation reported by the non-respondent faculty sample, we see no major apparent differences with patterns reported by the responding sample. There was a small difference for female Assistant Professors, who reported

TABLE III.13

ANALYSIS OF NON-RESPONDENT PARTICIPATION RATES
BY RANK AND GENDER
UC

Rank	Gender	n	Chi.Sq. (4df)	
Full	F	4	1.42	
	M	10	5.01	
Assoc	F	5	2.65	
	M	7	6.40	
Assist	F	13	8.56	$p \leq .07$
	M	11	4.15	
	Total	50		

somewhat less participation in programmatic activities (e.g., videotaping their teaching), and in programmatic combined with other activities. Altogether, there was minimum evidence of non-response bias.

C. GENDER AND RANK BIASES

A multiple logistic regression analysis was performed to assess the effects of gender and rank on participation in faculty development. These logistic functions were fit by segment using a weighted least squares method. All calculations were performed with the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) procedure CATMOD.

Fully saturated models with gender and rank as main effects were fit to the data reflecting participation in faculty development. Three levels of faculty development were used: no faculty development, participation in a single activity, and participation in multiple activities. For each regression, the no faculty development level was chosen as the base level. In other words, for each segment two logistic functions were estimated: one each for the single activity and multiple activity levels relative to the no development activity level.

The results of this analysis indicate that for both UC and CSU, female Assistant Professors tended to engage in the most faculty development (multiple activities), and male Full Professors tended to participate least.[36]

---

[36] The multiple logistic regression SAS/CATMOD tables are not shown here; they are technically complex and of interest primarily to professional statisticians.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND OBSERVERS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Dr. Eugene Cota-Robles, Assistant Vice President
Office of the President

Dr. Lubbe Levin, Assistant Vice President
Office of Employee Relations
Office of the President

ALTERNATE FOR DR. LEVIN;
Dr. Saul Geiser, Coordinator
Planning and Communications
Office of Employee Relations

Dr. Richard Gable, Chair, Academic Senate
Academic Senate Office

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Caesar Naples, Vice-Chancellor
Office of the Chancellor

Dr. Dorothy Miller, Faculty and Staff Relations
Office of the Chancellor

Dr. Bernard Goldstein, Chair, Academic Senate
Office of the Chancellor

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Dr. Rita Cepeda, Dean of Academic Standards
California Community Colleges

James Prager
Yuba College - Learning Skills

Dr. Harry Saterfield
Foothill Community College

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Marylin Cundiff Gee, Budget Analyst
Department of Finance

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST'S OFFICE

Charles Lieberman, Program Analyst
Paula Mishima Program Analyst
Legislative Budget Committee

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

William Furry, Consultant
Minority Ways and Means

Paul Holmes, Consultant
Senate Finance Committee

Janet Jamieson, Senior Policy Consultant - Education
Assembly Republican Caucus

Glee Johnson, Education Consultant
Minority Fiscal Consultants

Curtis Richards, Consultant
Assembly Sub-committee on Higher Education

Rick Simpson, Chief Consultant
Assembly Sub-committee on Educational Reform

Pamela Spratlen, Higher Education Consultant
Assembly Ways and Means

Dr. Ann Sutherland, Consultant
Senate Education Committee

OBSERVERS

Judith Ackley
California Federation of Teachers

Mary Astrid Bergan, Legislative Director
California Federation of Teachers

Gloria Blue, Assembly Fellow
Assemblyman Nolan's Office

Linda Bond, Consultant
Senate Education Committee

William Collins, Legislative Advocate
California Teachers Association

Robert Gurian, Legislative Advocate
California Faculty Association

Patrick McCallum, Executive Director
Faculty Association of the California
Community Colleges

Dr. Lowell Paige, Assistant Advisor - Education
Governor's Office - Education

Stephanie Travis, Principal Budget Analyst
University of California

Diane Van Hooke, Staff Development Chair
Association of California Community College Administrators

Sharon Yaap
California Association of Community Colleges

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

EXAMPLES OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Separate faculty- and campus-level data collection instruments were created for each segment, and a modified faculty questionnaire was prepared for distribution at UC San Francisco, which was the only medical school included in the study. An additional campus-level survey (Campus Survey II) was also sent to all the community colleges. This survey covered a subset of questions that had been asked in Campus Survey I (the survey sent to the original sample of 26 colleges), and it included a revised and enlarged set of instructions.

The study thus employed a total of eight separate data collection instruments -- three faculty questionnaires, three campus-level surveys, the UCSF faculty questionnaire, and the CCC Campus Survey II. Wherever possible, the same question wording and format were used across segments, though differences in segmental characteristics necessitated a number of adjustments.

Because the inclusion in this volume of all eight data collection instruments would create considerable bulk and redundancy, we provide below copies of the campus-level survey and faculty questionnaire used at CSU, as examples of the instruments employed by the study at all three segments.

SURVEY
ON
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

April 1, 1987

BERMAN, WEILER ASSOCIATES

INDIVIDUAL FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), under a directive from the state legislature, is studying faculty professional development in all three segments of California higher education. CPEC has contracted with Berman, Weiler Associates, an independent policy research firm, to assist them with this study.

The objective of the study is to find out:

1. how much professional development occurs for faculty;
2. what it costs;
3. what kinds of development activities take place; and
4. what the development needs are.

CPEC will use this information as the basis for developing policy recommendations to the legislature and the Department of Finance regarding future levels of state support for professional development in post-secondary education. **Your participation and candid response will be essential for formulation of future policy.** The information you provide, along with the results of another survey at the administrative level and additional findings from field work, will be used to help formulate state policy on support for faculty development at California's public colleges and universitites.

DEFINITION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The study assumes that professional development should be defined broadly to include a wide variety of activities that faculty engage in to maintain and improve their instructional abilities, their research skills, and their disciplinary knowledge. These activities include <u>improving teaching</u> (i.e. improving or refining instructional skills to increase student learning) and <u>curriculum development</u> (i.e., learning how to augment or improve a broad program of study or how to create or improve course materials); and <u>research-related activities</u>, (i.e. acquiring skills needed to do research, and conducting research or disseminating research findings or staying current in your field or discipline).

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

This questionnaire is designed to collect quantitative information only. Many faculty development activities are informal and not susceptible to quantitative measurement. In addition to this survey we will be conducting site-based field work in order to achieve a better understanding of these activities.

You are part of a carefully selected sample of faculty on your campus which is being asked to complete this question- naire as part of the CPEC study. Your answers will be entirely confidential and anonymous; only aggregate survey data will be reported.

This questionnaire looks bulky, but many of the questions are multiple choice and they are formatted to be answered easily. We estimate it should take you about 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. We would greatly appreciate your taking this time to answer the questions. <u>When you complete the questionnaire, please return it to your campus liaison.</u>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

1. WHAT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE YOU PARTICIPATED IN DURING THIS ACADEMIC YEAR, BETWEEN March 31, 1986, and APRIL 1, 1987, THAT INVOLVED EITHER (a) RESEARCH or (b) CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT or (c) EFFORTS TO IMPROVE YOUR OWN INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITIES or (d) STAYING CURRENT IN THE FIELD (Please do not include training teaching assistants or readers, unless this activity entailed learning how to train them.)

Please look at the activities listed in Table 1, on the facing page. If you participated in any of the activities in Table 1, please

- Indicate (in the bracket) each activity in which you participated;
- Select your objective(s) for participating in the activity from among the objectives listed below; and enter it/them in Column A
- Enter the total time the activity entailed during the academic year in Column B; and
- Indicate how effective the activity was in meeting your objective, in Column C.

TO INDICATE ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Please take a minute or so to familiarize yourself with the objectives below.
Then enter the number of the objective that most closely fits your main objective for the activity into space under "Main Obj." If there was a second objective for the activity, please put the number of that objective in the space marked "Second Obj."
IF NONE OF THESE OBJECTIVES FIT, PLEASE USE THE 'OTHER' CATEGORY (OBJECTIVE 12 OR 13, BELOW) AND WRITE THE DEFINITION IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

List of Objectives

No	Objective
	Improving instructional abilities
1	Improving teaching style or skills in presenting material in the classroom
2	Improving ability to use technology, computers, or audio-visual aids in the classroom
3	Enhance awareness of adult development or learning theory
	Developing curricula
4	Developing curricula or revising courses
	Addressing students' learning needs
5	Improving skills in assessing learning needs or student progress
6	Developing awareness of the cultural perspectives affecting the learning styles of ethnic minorities
7	Developing skills in teaching students with limited English proficiency
	Increasing knowledge or maintaining currency
8	Learning a new discipline or field
9	Keeping current in a discipline or field
10	Contributing knowledge to the field
11	Enhancing research skills
12	Other? Please specify: _____
13	Other? Please specify: _____

[NOTE, this list of activities does not include on- or off-campus seminars, conferences, symposia, etc. We will ask about these activities in a later question.]

TABLE 1
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
(TEACHING, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, RESEARCH)

If you did not participate in any of the activities please check here [ ] and proceed to Question 3 on Page 4.

Check Activities in which you participated	Column A: Your main objective(s) for an activity (See facing page for the objective number) Main Obj.	Second Obj.	Column B: Total time you spent (including making arrangements) 3/31/86-4/1/87	Column C: Effectiveness in — Meeting your Objectives — [1 Not	2 Some	3 Mod.	4 Very	5] Extremely
[ ] Videotaping of your teaching	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5
[ ] Observation of peers' classes (Do not include the observations you might make in evaluating peers for retention or promotion)	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5
[ ] Direct assistance from specialists at the Univ./College, e.g., Teacher Resource Center or Research/Grant Center specialist	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5
[ ] Mentoring program, as, mentor, on instructional abilities or research	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5
[ ] Mentoring program, as mentored, on instructional abilities or research	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5
[ ] Studying specialized materials (e.g., books, training films, video tapes or articles)	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5
[ ] Developing, preparing to teach &/or teaching experimental or new courses and curricula	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5
[ ] On-campus course for improvement in instructional abilities, curricular development, or enhancing research capabilities (If you attended more than 1 course, please check here for the first, and use the "other" category for the second course)	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5
[ ] Off-campus course for improving instructional abilities, developing curricula, or research skills (If you attended more than 1 course, please check here for the first, and use the "other" category for the second course)	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5
[ ] Summer institute	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5
[ ] Other? Please specify	_ _	_ _	Objective # ___ tot hrs.	1	2	3	4	5

ON CAMPUS-COURSES

2. If you checked that you participated in one or more ON-CAMPUS COURSES, please answer parts a, b, and c below. Otherwise, please continue with Question 3, below.

a. Was the fee waived for the first course you attended?

[ ] 1. Yes

[ ] 2. No

b. Was the fee waived for the second course you attended?

[ ] 1. Yes

[ ] 2. No

[ ] 9. Not Applicable

c. Was the fee waived for the third or additional courses you attended?

[ ] 1. Yes

[ ] 2. No

[ ] 9. Not Applicable

The questions below primarily concern RESEARCH by which we mean creating and/or disseminating new knowledge in a discipline or professional field, or staying current in your field

3a. Between March 31, 1986 and April 1, 1987, on the average, how many hours per week do you expend on all your professional duties, including teaching, research, advising students, participating in faculty meetings, etc?

__ average hrs per week during Summer all duties

__ average hrs per week during Academic Year on all duties

3b. Did you conduct research during either the Academic Year -- from August 15, 1986 to April 1, 1987, or during the Summer of 1986 (either on or off-campus)?

[ ] 1) Yes

[ ] 2) No (Please continue with Question 6 on Page 6)

3c. Please indicate below during which period (if any) this research occurred, and the average number of hours per week that you engaged in it.

[ ] 1. Academic year __ hours per week

[ ] 2. Summer __ hours per week

4. What was the source of support for your time in these research activities? Please place a check mark in both the Academic year and Summer columns, as the sources of support might be different.

Acad. Year	Sum-mer	
[ ]	[ ]	1. Federal grant or contract
[ ]	[ ]	2. State grant or contract
[ ]	[ ]	3. Private contract
[ ]	[ ]	4. Campus or CSU system funding
[ ]	[ ]	5. No funding
[ ]	[ ]	6. Other, Please specify:_____

5. If you conducted research during the academic year, did you have released or assigned time to engage in these activities?

[ ] 1. Yes

[ ] 2. No

OFF-CAMPUS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

6. How many OFF-CAMPUS activities as (a) conferences, professional meetings, workshops, seminar series, symposia, lectures, and retreats, (b) courses, or (c) summer institutes did you participate in, between March 31, 1986 and April 1, 1987? Please count only those which were specifically directed toward improving instructional skills, improving curricular development, enhancing research skills, or keeping current in your field or discipline. (Please do include retreats for discussion of departmental, campus, or university matters.)

__ # off-campus. **(If none, please continue with question 7 on page 10)**

IF YOU ENGAGED IN ANY OF THESE ACTIVITIES, PLEASE COMPLETE TABLE 2. For each conference, workshop, (etc.), course or summer institute -- up to five such events -- we would like you to:

- Check (in the bracket) the type of activity it was;
- Enter the length of time you attended the event (including travel);
- Indicate the costs of attending;
- Indicate approximately what percent of funds came from the sources listed;
- Indicate your objective(s) for participating in the activity, from among those listed below.

TO INDICATE COSTS

We realize this may be difficult, but it will assist with decisions regarding funds allocation. Therefore, please provide the best information you can.

If you attended a conference and a workshop attached to it, both of which were relevant to instructional improvement; please list both, but attribute the costs to the conference. We have provided a box under costs to accomodate this possibility.

TO INDICATE ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Enter the number of the objective that most closely fits your main objective for the activity into space under "Main Obj." If there was a second objective for the activity, please put the number of that objective in the space marked "Second Obj." IF NONE OF THESE OBJECTIVES FIT, PLEASE USE THE 'OTHER' CATEGORY (OBJECTIVE 12 OR 13, BELOW) AND WRITE THE DEFINITION IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

List of Objectives

No	Objective
	Improving instructional abilities
1	Improving teaching style or skills in presenting material in the classroo
2	Improving ability to use technology, computers, or audio-visual aids in the classroom
3	Enhance awareness of adult development or learning theory
	Developing curricula
4	Developing curricula or revising courses
	Addressing students' learning needs
5	Improving skills in assessing learning needs or student progress
6	Developing awareness of the cultural perspectives affecting the learning styles of ethnic minorities
7	Developing skills in teaching students with limited English proficiency
	Increasing knowledge or maintaining currency
8	Learning a new discipline or field
9	Keeping current in a discipline or field
10	Contributing knowledge to the field
11	Enhancing research skills
12	Other? Please specify: _____
13	Other? Please specify: _____

TABLE 2

OFF-CAMPUS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
(TEACHING, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, RESEARCH, KEEPING CURRENT IN THE FIELD)

OFF-CAMPUS ACTIVITY

What type of professional development activity was it?

[ ] 1. Conference, Seminar, Workshop, Lecture [ ] 2. Course
[ ] 3. Summer Institute or Workshop

Number of days you attended	Costs of attending regardless of who paid	Approx. % from each source	Main Objective(s) for Activity (See facing page for the list of Objective Numbers) Main Obj.	Second Obj.
__ days	Total Cost: $____.00	___% Federal grant or contract	--	--
	Registration and Materials: $___.00	___% State grant or contract		
		___% Private grant or contract		
	Travel and Per diem: $____.00	___% Dept., School, Coll., or Univ.		
	Other: $____.00	___% Personal funds		
	Please Describe:	___% Sponsoring org.		
[ ] This was a workshop whose cost is included in that of an associated conference, listed separately below.		___% Other? _____		
		___% Don't Know		

OFF-CAMPUS ACTIVITY

What type of professional development activity was it?

[ ] 1. Conference, Seminar, Workshop, Lecture [ ] 2. Course
[ ] 3. Summer Institute or Workshop

Number of days you attended	Costs of attending regardless of who paid	Approx. % from each source	Main Objective(s) for Activity (See facing page for the list of Objective Numbers) Main Obj.	Second Obj.
__ days	Total Cost: $____.00	___% Federal grant or contract	--	--
	Registration and Materials: $___.00	___% State grant or contract		
		___% Private grant or contract		
	Travel and Per diem: $____.00	___% Dept., School, Coll., or Univ.		
	Other: $____.00	___% Personal funds		
	Please Describe:	___% Sponsoring org.		
[ ] This was a workshop whose cost is included in that of an associated conference, listed separately below.		___% Other? _____		
		___% Don't Know		

List of Objectives

(This is the same list as on page 6, repeated here for your convenience.)

No	Objective
	Improving instructional abilities
1	Improving teaching style or skills in presenting material in the classroom
2	Improving ability to use technology, computers, or audio-visual aids in the classroom
3	Enhance awareness of adult development or learning theory
	Developing curricula
4	Developing curricula or revising courses
	Addressing students' learning needs
5	Improving skills in assessing learning needs or student progress
6	Developing awareness of the cultural perspectives affecting the learning styles of ethnic minorities
7	Developing skills in teaching students with limited English proficiency
	Increasing knowledge or maintaining currency
8	Learning a new discipline or field
9	Keeping current in a discipline or field
10	Contributing knowledge to the field
11	Enhancing research skills
12	Other? Please specify: _____
13	Other? Please specify: _____

#9 OFF-CAMPUS ACTIVITY

What type of professional development activity was it?

[ ] 1. Conference, Seminar, Workshop, Lecture [ ] 2. Course
[ ] 3. Summer Institute or Workshop

Number of days you attended	Costs of attending regardless of who paid	Approx. % from each source	Main Objective(s) for Activity (See facing page for the list of Objective Numbers) Main Obj.	Second Obj.
__ days	Total Cost: $____.00	___% Federal grant or contract	--	--
	Registration and Materials: $___.00	___% State grant or contract		
	Travel and Per diem: $____.00	___% Private grant or contract		
	Other: $____.00 Please Describe:	___% Dept., School, Coll., or Univ.		
		___% Personal funds		
		___% Sponsoring org.		
		___% Other? _____		
		___% Don't Know		

[ ] This was a workshop whose cost is included in that of an associated conference, listed separately below.

#4 OFF-CAMPUS ACTIVITY

What type of professional development activity was it?

[ ] 1. Conference, Seminar, Workshop, Lecture [ ] 2. Course
[ ] 3. Summer Institute or Workshop

Number of days you attended

__ days

Costs of attending regardless of who paid

Total Cost: $____.00

Registration and Materials: $___.00

Travel and Per diem: $____.00

Other: $____.00
Please Describe:

Approx. % from each source

___% Federal grant or contract
___% State grant or contract
___% Private grant or contract
___% Dept., School, Coll., or Univ.
___% Personal funds
___% Sponsoring org.
___% Other?_____
___% Don't Know

Main Objective(s) for Activity (See facing page for the list of Objective Numbers)

Main Obj.	Second Obj.
--	--

[ ] This was a workshop whose cost is included in that of an associated conference, listed separately below.

#5 OFF-CAMPUS ACTIVITY

What type of professional development activity was it?

[ ] 1. Conference, Seminar, Workshop, Lecture [ ] 2. Course
[ ] 3. Summer Institute or Workshop

Number of days you attended

__ days

Costs of attending regardless of who paid

Total Cost: $____.00

Registration and Materials: $___.00

Travel and Per diem: $____.00

Other: $____.00
Please Describe:

Approx. % from each source

___% Federal grant or contract
___% State grant or contract
___% Private grant or contract
___% Dept., School, Coll., or Univ.
___% Personal funds
___% Sponsoring org.
___% Other?_____
___% Don't Know

Main Objective(s) for Activity (See facing page for the list of Objective Numbers)

Main Obj.	Second Obj.
--	--

[ ] This was a workshop whose cost is included in that of an associated conference, listed separately below.

ON-CAMPUS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCES, SEMINARS, WORKSHOPS, LECTURES

7. How many <u>on-campus</u> conferences, seminars, workshops, symposia, lectures, etc., including those attended during flexible calendar days (but <u>not</u> courses or summer institutes) did you attend during the period between March 31, 1986 and April 1, 1987? <u>We are interested only in those that focused specifically on improving instruction , curriculum development, or enhancing research capability or staying current in your field</u>

__ # attended on-campus. **(If None please continue with Question 8 on Page 12)**

IF YOU ENGAGED IN ANY OF THESE ACTIVITIES, PLEASE COMPLETE TABLE 3. For each conference, workshop, (etc.), -- up to four such events -- we would like you to indicate:

- the length of time you attended the event
- your objective(s) for participating in the activity from among the the objectives listed below
- how effective the activity was in meeting your objective(s);
- the source of funding

If you attended more than four conferences, seminars, workshops, etc., please give us information about four you attended during this period.

TO INDICATE ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Enter the number of the objective that most closely fits your main objective for the activity into space under <u>"Main Obj."</u> If there was a second objective for the activity, please put the number of that objective in the space marked <u>"Second Obj."</u> IF NONE OF THESE OBJECTIVES FIT, PLEASE USE THE 'OTHER' CATEGORY (OBJECTIVE 12 OR 13) AND WRITE THE DEFINITION IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

List of Objectives

<u>No</u>	<u>Objective</u>
	Improving instructional abilities
1	Improving teaching style or skills in presenting material in the classroom
2	Improving ability to use technology, computers, or audio-visual aids in the classroom
3	Enhance awareness of adult development or learning theory
	Developing curricula
4	Developing curricula or revising courses
	Addressing students' learning needs
5	Improving skills in assessing learning needs or student progress
6	Developing awareness of the cultural perspectives affecting the learning styles of ethnic minorities
7	Developing skills in teaching students with limited English proficiency
	Increasing knowledge or maintaining currency
8	Learning a new discipline or field
9	Keeping current in a discipline or field
10	Contributing knowledge to the field
11	Enhancing research skills
12	Other? Please specify: _____
13	Other? Please specify: _____

TABLE 3 - ON-CAMPUS ACTIVITIES

ON-CAMPUS ACTIVITY

Total No. of hours attended	Your main objectives for an activity (See facing page for the objective number) Main	Second	Effectiveness in ----- Meeting your Objectives ----- Not	Some	Mod.	Very	Extremely	Source of Funding
__	__	__ Objective #	1	2	3	4	5	[ ] 1. Univ., School, Coll. [ ] 2. Outside Univ., School, Coll. [ ] 3. Personal, not reimbursed [ ] 4. Don't know

#2 ON-CAMPUS ACTIVITY

Total No. of hours attended	Your main objectives for an activity (See facing page for the objective number) Main	Second	Effectiveness in ----- Meeting your Objectives ----- Not	Some	Mod.	Very	Extremely	Source of Funding
__	__	__ Objective #	1	2	3	4	5	[ ] 1. Univ., School, Coll. [ ] 2. Outside Univ., School, Coll. [ ] 3. Personal, not reimbursed [ ] 4. Don't know

#3 ON-CAMPUS ACTIVITY

Total No. of hours attended	Your main objectives for an activity (See facing page for the objective number) Main	Second	Effectiveness in ----- Meeting your Objectives ----- Not	Some	Mod.	Very	Extremely	Source of Funding
__	__	__ Objective #	1	2	3	4	5	[ ] 1. Univ., School, Coll. [ ] 2. Outside Univ., School, Coll. [ ] 3. Personal, not reimbursed [ ] 4. Don't know

#4 ON-CAMPUS ACTIVITY

Total No. of hours attended	Your main objectives for an activity (See facing page for the objective number) Main	Second	Effectiveness in ----- Meeting your Objectives ----- Not	Some	Mod.	Very	Extremely	Source of Funding
__	__	__ Objective #	1	2	3	4	5	[ ] 1. Univ., School, Coll. [ ] 2. Outside Univ., School, Coll. [ ] 3. Personal, not reimbursed [ ] 4. Don't know

THIS SECTION ASKS QUESTIONS ABOUT THE NEED FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

8. If your college had $ X additional funds, what percent of these funds should be allocated to each of the following professional development activities? Please answer separately for each list; and please be sure the percents add up to 100% for each list.

LIST A: ACROSS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEED

___ % Furthering research

___ % Furthering teaching improvement

___ % Furthering curriculum development

100 % Total funds

LIST B: ACROSS FUNDING CATEGORIES, IN GENERAL

___ % Travel, including conference attendance

___ % Membership in professional associations

___ % Secretarial support

___ % Reduced teaching load in order to participate in professional development activities

___ % Supplies and equipment (including computersand software)

___ % Other? Please Specify_____

100 % Total funds

LIST C: FOR ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITIES

___ % **Improving instructional abilities** (including improving skills in presenting material in the classroom, improving teaching style or approach; developing alternative methods of delivery; and improving ability to use technology, computers, or audio visual aids in the classroom; and enhancing awareness of adult development or learning theory).

___ % **Developing curricula** (including learning how to augment or improve a broad program of study or how to create or improve course materials, creating or revising courses)

___ % **Addressing students' learning needs** (including improving skills in assessing learning needs or student progress, developing awareness of the cultural perspectives affecting the learning styles of ethnic minorities, developing skills in teaching to students with limited English proficiency

___ % **Increasing knowledge and/or maintaining currency** (including learning a new discipline or field, keeping current in a discipline or field, contributing knowledge to the field, enhancing research skills

___ % Other Please specify: _____

100 % Total Funds

Question continues on following page with List D

LIST D: FOR INCREASING KNOWLEDGE OR KEEPING CURRENT IN YOUR FIELD

___ % Conducting research

___ % Enhancing research skills

___ % Disseminating research results

___ % Maintaining currency in field

___ % Other? Please Specify_____

100 % Total funds Page 13

HOW ADEQUATE IS THE AMOUNT OF SUPPORT OFFERED TO YOU in the following areas? and How should this level of support be changed in the next 5 years?

	CURRENT Adequacy of Support					HOW SHOULD Emphasis be Changed				
	Very Low		About Right		Extr High	Much Less		Stay Same		Much Higher
Improving instructional abilities (including improving teaching style or skills in presenting material in class or approach, or developing alternative methods of delivery.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Improving ability to use technology in your teaching (including use of computers or audio-visual aids).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Developing curricula (including learning how to augment or improve a broad program of study or how to create or improve course materials, creating or revising courses).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Addressing student learning needs (including improving skills in assessing student learning needs or progress or developing awareness of the cultural perspectives affecting learning styles of ethnic minorities or developing skills in teaching students with limited English proficiency or developing skills in teaching in remedial or transitional contexts).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Increasing knowledge and/or maintaining currency in your field (including learning a new discipline or field, keeping current in a discipline or field, contributing knowledge or enhancing research skills.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

10. What do you feel is your greatest need for professional development, if any?

a) In instructional abilities_____

_____

b) In curriculum development_____

_____

c) In research_____

_____

d) In staying current in your field_____

_____

e) Other_____

_____

RESPONDENT DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

11. As of April 1, 1987, how old were you?

[ ] 1) 20-30 years old;
[ ] 2) 31-40 years old;
[ ] 3) 41-50 years old;
[ ] 4) 51-60 years old;
[ ] 5) 61+

12. Are you

[ ] 1) Female? [ ] 2) Male?

13. Which of the following racial, national, or ethnic groups do you think of as your own?

[ ] 1) American Indian
[ ] 2) Asian
[ ] 3) Black
[ ] 4) Hispanic/Latino
[ ] 5) Mexican American
[ ] 6) White
[ ] 7) Other?
Please indicate _____

14. Are you tenured?

[ ] 1) Yes [ ] 2) No-if no, please indicate if you are

[ ] 3) On tenure
[ ] 4) On contract, non-tenure track

15. As of the end of the academic year 1986-87, how many years will you have been teaching at this institution?

__ Number of years

16. As of the end of the academic year 1986-87, how many years will you have you been teaching at the postsecondary level?

__ Number of years

17. Is your campus on the:

[ ] 1) Quarter system? [ ] 2) Semester system?

18. Since March 31, 1986, have you had a temporary reduction in teaching load for the purposes of improving instructional skills, curriculum development, research, or staying current in your field?

[ ] 1) Yes
[ ] 2) No (Please continue with Question 20)

19. For what purpose was the assigned time used; how much time was assigned; and for how many quarters (or semesters) dit it apply?

Purpose	How much time	Duration
[ ] Instructional	___%	_ # quarters (or semesters)
[ ] Curriculum	___%	_ # quarters (or semesters)
[ ] Research	___%	_ # quarters (or semesters)
[ ] Other?	___%	_ # quarters (or semesters)

Please specify: _____

20. What is your rank?

[ ] 1) Lecturer
[ ] 2) Assistant Professor
[ ] 3) Associate Professor
[ ] 4) Professor
[ ] 5) Other? _____

21. In which of the following ranges is your salary?

[ ] 1) Under $20,000
[ ] 2) $20,001 to $25,000
[ ] 3) $25,001 to $30,000
[ ] 4) $30,001 to $35,000
[ ] 5) $35,001 to $40,000
[ ] 6) $40,001 to $45,000
[ ] 7) $45,001 to $50,000
[ ] 8) $50,001 to $55,000
[ ] 9) $55,001 to $60,000
[ ]10) $60,001 to $65,000
[ ]11) $65,001 to $70,000
[ ]12) $70,001 to $75,000
[ ]13) $75,001 and above

22. Is your employment

[ ] 1) Permanent full-time at the University?
[ ] 2) Temporary full-time at the University?
[ ] 3) Permanent part time at the Univeristy?
[ ] 4) Temporary part-time at the University?

23. Have you had a sabbatical leave since the 1982-1983 academic year?

[ ] 1. Yes
[ ] 2. No (Please continue with Question 25)

24a. For what purposes was the sabbatic used and how long did it last?

Purpose	Duration
[ ] 1.Improving instructional abilities	_ # Quarters or semesters
[ ] 2. Curriculum development	_ # Quarters or semesters
[ ] 3. Increasing knowledge, research or staying current in your field	_ # Quarters or semesters

24b. Did the sabbatical leave occur between March 31, 1986 and April 1, 1987?

[ ] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No

25. What is the name of your department? _____

At which campus are you located? _____

26. In what discipline, field or professional area do you primarily teach?

[ ] 1) **Arts and Humanitites**, including art, architecture, music, theater, English, foreign languages, philosophy, and speech
[ ] 2) **Physical and Life Sciences**, including biology, chemistry, geology, physics, math and computer science
[ ] 3) **Social Sciences**, including anthropology, economics, ethnic studies, geography, history, political science, psychology, and sociology
[ ] 4) **Applied Physical Science**, including agriculture, animal and plant science, natural resources, engineering, civil engineering, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, health and safety, and nursing
[ ] 5) **Applied Social Sciences**, including accounting, business administration, communication, finance, home economics, law enforcement, marketing, public administration, recreation , and social welfare
[ ] 6) **Education**, including counseling, educational administration, industrial arts, instructional media and librarianship, physical education, special education, teacher education
[ ] 7) **Librarians**
[ ] 8) Other _____

THANKS AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME

SURVEY OF

PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES AIMED AT DEVELOPING INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH-RELATED SKILLS AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

April 21, 1987

B E R M A N, W E I L E R A S S O C I A T E S

PROGRAMS FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

This study concerns what campuses and/or organizations on campuses were doing either to support faculty professional development activities or to provide development services directly to faculty, in fiscal year 1985-86. It is a companion to a questionnaire distributed to individual faculty members to obtain information on similar issues. CPEC will use this information, along with field work that will obtain more qualitative information, as the basis for developing policy recommendations to the legislature and the Department of Finance regarding future levels of state support for faculty development in postsecondary education.

The types of programs or services that are the focal point of this study are those which help faculty to:

- o improve instructional skills,
- o improve ways in which they advise students,
- o improve techniques for assessing student progress,
- o improve curriculum,
- o carry out scholarship; research; or professional work in creative and fine arts,
- o stay current in their field or discipline.

PLEASE TAKE A FEW MOMENTS TO BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THE APPROACH, THE TERMS USED, AND THE DEFINITIONS

The questions we ask are straightforward, but they require that we share an understanding of the objectives of the study and the nuances of the issues with which we are dealing.

In this questionnaire, activities or programs for faculty development in the above areas are divided into five different categories:

1. Direct Services
2. Direct Support
3. Affirmative Action
4. Non-instructional Staff
5. Needs

We will ask questions concerning:

a) the kinds of activities or programs available;
b) whether these activities are a temporary or permanent part of faculty development efforts;
c) the length of time they have existed, and whether they are still continuing;
d) the number of faculty served;

and then for each of the above programs or services, in general:

e) expenditures, overall and separately for instructional and other development activities, and by object code (e.g. salary); and
f) sources of funding.

DEFINITIONS ESSENTIAL TO COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Direct Services

Direct Services are programs, activities or assistance provided directly to faculty for improving faculty skills in instruction, advising students, assessing student progress, developing curricula, developing or carrying out scholarship, research or creative endeavors, and/or staying current in their field or discipline. (Please do not include affirmative action programs here.)

The purest example of these activities or programs might be a teaching resource center, housed in an office with direct responsibility for working with faculty to improve teaching, e.g. through videotaping, or helping them use visual aids or improve their skills in assessing student progress.

Another example might be a Center for Developing Research Grants. In this case, however, we only are interested in that portion of the Center that actually works with faculty on developing the grants for research or creative endeavors; not the part which administers the grants or contract.

or

An Assistant Director of Instructional Computing might work with faculty to improve their use of computers in the classroom -- even though this person also may work with students. Again, we are interested only in that percent of time devoted to working with faculty on instruction, research, professional performance, or scholarship -- not routine assistance to faculty. If the computing facility is involved in this (for us) mixed purpose, only the proportion of Center activities that contributes to faculty development should be included in your calculations.

Please do not include in your estimates the time or salaries of supervisors at the campus level who review budgets of these programs or services, or who oversee personnel policies. A general rule for us is that we only count staff and/or supervisor time if:

- they were hired or assigned to work on faculty development activities;
- they were on released time and their original duties were being carried out by other staff.

As before, please count only that fraction of staff and/or supervisor time that was devoted to faculty development activities -- not time devoted to other normal administrative duties.

Other types of services or activities include funds made available to invite speakers onto campus to address issues related directly to instructional improvement (e.g. presentation of subject matter, teaching style, assessing student progress or advising); research or scholarship; or professional work in the fine or performing arts. These funds might be for travel grants or honoraria.

Direct Support

Direct Support focuses on monies or equipment provided to faculty to help them improve their teaching, research or scholarship. (Please do not include affirmative action funds here.)

Examples of these activities might be:

- o grants offered to faculty to focus on a specific teaching methods or update disciplinary knowledge;
- o monies or released time to work with others in a formal mentoring role on teaching methods, etc.;
- o monies or released time to attend conferences, workshops, symposia, lectures which were offered either on or off-campus, for these purposes.

Mixed Services and Support

Some faculty development programs may offer both direct services and direct support to faculty, and cannot easily beassigned to either category for purposes of estimating expenditures. The questionnaire provides a separate section for these mixed cases. Please note, however, that if a teaching resource center (for example) provides direct services and administers grants or other direct support, it should be treated as a direct service program, and the grants it administers should be counted as part of direct support to faculty.

Affirmative Action

Affirmative Action here refers to assistance in the form of dedicated programs or targeted money, equipment or released time offered to women and minorities to develop their skills. (Please do not include recruitment programs, or programs/activities/funding listed above.)

Non-instructional Staff

Non-instructional Staff These are all non-teaching staff -- including administrators, financial aid personnel, counselors, secretaries, maintenance personnel, etc., for whom staff development programs might exist.

Examples of these programs might be seminars in computing skills, financial management, or stress management. They might offer direct services or funds to offset tuition or travel to participate in seminars or classes, or they might consist of waiving course fees for classes taken on campus. For these staff we are only interested in affirmative action programs.

CLARIFICATION OF THE QUESTIONS WE ARE ASKING

A) Kinds of Activities or Programs Available:

We request that you list the types of activities available to encourage or support improvement and/or staying current in instructional skills (e.g. developing or delivering curricula, assessing student progress, or advising students), research and scholarship, and performance in the fine or creative arts.

B) Whether these Activities are Temporary or Permanent:

Temporary activities are provided for a specific period of time; permanent activities are not.

C) Length of Time Activities Have Existed, and Whether they Continue:

This is indicated by whether these activities have existed at least since FY 1981, and whether they are in existence in FY 1986-1987.

D) Number of Faculty Served

Please include in your calculations all faculty members who are served, without distinguishing among them by rank, amount of time they work, or any other factor.

E) Expenditures -- Overall, Separately for Instructional and Other Purposes, and by Object Categories:

Expenditures are the actual dollars spent for all the services you offer and all the direct support you offer. We also request that you break expenditures down by whether they were used to improve instruction or whether they were used for other purposes (combining research, scholarship, staying current and professional presentation); and for certain object categories -- namely:

- salaries (with benefits)
- fees paid to outside speakers, consultants, or others,
- supplies and equipment used for the service or support, (but not including fixed assets of the university);
- travel and per diem;
- other

F) Sources of Funding for the Activities:

We would like to know the sources of funding for for all the services you offer and all the direct support, from all sources, related to faculty development. We would like to know the revenues from:

o System	System-wide dollars specifically earmarked for faculty improvement activities. An example is Affirmative Action Faculty Development funds.
o Campus/State	All state funds -- i.e. any funds that are part of the state-provided campus budget (do not include here funds from other sources listed).
o Campus/Other	Non-state funding at the campus level, such as indirect fees from grants which are able to be reassigned for faculty development purposes.
o State Agencies	Grants from the state for research or other faculty development activities.
o State/Other	Funding from specific state monies earmarked for faculty development. Examples of this might be irrigation study grants.
o Federal	Funding only from specific federal agencies related to faculty development. Examples of this might be federal research grants. Do not count equipment grants.
o Private	Funding from private contracts or grants or raised from donations and used specifically for faculty development. Examples of this might be "Friends of the Library" funds or corporate grants.
o Professional Orgs.	Funding provided by professional organizations for the purpose of faculty development.
o Other	Other sources of support for funding of these activities.

Activity

Any activity or part of an activity that helps faculty to improve or stay current with developments in instruction, research, scholarship or professional performance in the fine or creative arts.

If it is part of an activity -- e.g. part of a computer center or part of a grant development center -- for the indication of expenditure, please estimate the fraction of staff time devoted to faculty development.

Direct Services -- Types of services available have been described as a center for effective teaching; a center for grants and research which actually works with faculty to develop grant solicitation skills; a computer center which works with faculty on improving their use of computers in classroom, research, or professional presentations; or a media center which works with faculty on improving use of visual aids in class, research, or professional presentations.

Direct Support -- Types of direct support have been described as grants for assigned time; sabbatical; waiver of course fees; travel related to improving instruction, research, scholarship, or professional creative production (or staying current in these areas); and other incentives such as teaching recognition awards. Such support is not always in dollars; sometimes equipment or supplies, secretarial time or other awards have been made.

Visiting scholars at the University, should be included under direct services, if they receive honoraria or travel support, and/or other expenditures are involved, and if these visits are related to faculty development (rather than recruitment).

Memberships in professional organizations can be charged if they are paid for by the University, and if they relate directly to faculty development activities.

Expenditures

Released time. Calculate the expense of replacing the faculty member who is and released from teaching duties in order to pursue or manage faculty development activities. Please do not count assigned time used for activities other than those related to faculty development -- e.g., do not include assigned time for faculty senate duties, or for department chair or campus service activities. Please do not double count or include overload issues in your calculations.

Supervisor time. Include only that part of supervisory time employed directly for faculty development activities.

Other. Do not include overhead, in-kind contributions (such as space which is not a direct program outlay), and/or "voluntary" time.

Fixed assets, such as space, should be charged only if they result in a direct expenditure for the service or support, i.e. renting space outside or on-campus.

Affirmative action. The programs we are interested in relate specifically to developing skills, not to recruitment.

THE NEXT SECTIONS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

ask identical questions

about 3 categories of faculty development:

1. direct services,
2. direct support, and
3. programs of mixed services and support.

DIRECT SERVICES TO FACULTY TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION (e.g. METHODOLOGY, CURRICULA, STUDENT ASSESSMENT OR ADVISING); RESEARCH; PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE; SCHOLARSHIP; OR MAINTAINING CURRENCY

I. Please briefly describe the direct services provided to faculty for any or all of the following purposes -- improving instructional skills (e.g. methods, curricula, assessment of student abilities or techniques for advising); research or performance development for the fine and creative arts; scholarship and maintaining currency in a field. (Please do not include programs or services specifically for women or minority faculty; these are included in Question XVI on Page 19)

Please see Rules of Thumb for assistance with identifying these activities.

[ ] Check here if none, and proceed to Question VI on Page 7

	TYPES OF DIRECT SERVICES	PURPOSES/GOALS
A.		
B.		
C.		
D.		
E.		
F.		

NOTE THAT ALTHOUGH WE HAVE LEFT SPACE FOR ONLY SIX DIRECT SERVICES, WE ARE INTERESTED IN ALL OF THEM. IF SERVICES EXCEED THIS NUMBER, PLEASE REPRODUCE THE PAGES FOR QUESTIONS I AND II AS NEEDED.

DESCRIPTION OF DIRECT SERVICES TO FACULTY TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, ARTS PERFORMANCES, OR MAINTAINING CURRENCY

II. Please describe the nature of each program/service on the facing page, including:

- o whether it existed prior to FY 1981;
- o whether the service continues in FY 1986-'87;
- o whether it has a defined termination date;
- o the number of faculty served (if available).

ACTIVITY A LISTED IN QUESTION I

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?	2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?	3. Does it have a known termination date?
[ ] 1. Yes	[ ] 1. Yes	[ ] 1. Yes
[ ] 2. No	[ ] 2. No	[ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

_ _ _ _ # of faculty

[ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY B LISTED IN QUESTION I

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?	2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?	3. Does it have a known termination date?
[ ] 1. Yes	[ ] 1. Yes	[ ] 1. Yes
[ ] 2. No	[ ] 2. No	[ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

_ _ _ _ # of faculty

[ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

(question II, continued: DESCRIPTION OF DIRECT SERVICES TO FACULTY)

ACTIVITY C, LISTED IN QUESTION I

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY D LISTED IN QUESTION I

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

(Question II, continued: DESCRIPTION OF DIRECT SERVICES TO FACULTY)

ACTIVITY E. LISTED IN QUESTION I

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY F LISTED IN QUESTION I

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

FY 1985-'86 EXPENDITURES FOR DIRECT SERVICES TO FACULTY

III. Please indicate total expenditures for direct services for faculty development; see the Rules of Thumb for assistance in developing this figure).

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 (Grand) Total for direct services in faculty development, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

A. Of this total, please estimate, if possible, the total expenditure related specifically to instruction, (including methods, curriculum development, assessing student progress or advising students).

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total for Instructional Purposes, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

B. If you cannot estimate the total expenditure related specifically to instruction, can you estimate the following:

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total definitely for Instructional Purposes, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total definitely not for Instructional purposes, including fringe, but not overhead

IV. For the Grand total for faculty development, please tell us the amount spent in the following categories:

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Salaries and benefits

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Fees (e.g. consultants, visiting scholars, etc.)

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Supplies and Equipment

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Travel and Per Diem

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Other (for example, membership costs in professional organizations directly related to the above)

FY 1985-'86 EXPENDITURES FOR DIRECT SERVICES TO FACULTY
- continued -

V. Again, for the grand total of expenditures for direct services, please indicate the amount of revenue from each of the following sources:

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 System-wide dollars specifically earmarked for faculty improvement activities

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Campus/State -- i.e. any funds that are part of the state-provided campus budget

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Campus/Other -- i.e. Non-state funding at the campus level, e.g. indirect fees from grants reassigned for faculty development purposes.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 State Agency -- Grants from the state for research or other faculty development activities.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 State/Other -- Funding from specific state monies earmarked for faculty development, e.g. irrigation study grants

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Federal funding -- Funding only from federal agencies related to faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Private funding raised from donations and used specifically for faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Funding by Professional Organizations for faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Other sources of support for funding these activities.

DIRECT SUPPORT TO FACULTY

TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION (e.g. METHODOLOGY, CURRICULA, STUDENT ASSESSMENT OR ADVISING); RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, ARTS PERFORMANCE, OR MAINTAINING CURRENCY

VI. Please describe the direct support provided to faculty for any or all of the following purposes -- namely, improving: instructional skills (including methodology, curricula, assessment of student abilities, or techniques for advising students); research; performance development for the fine and creative arts; scholarship and maintaining currency in a field. (Please do not include programs or services specifically for women or minority faculty; these are included in Question XVI on Page 19.)

(Examples might include sabbaticals; direct grants for released time; travel related to the above purposes; or waiver of course fees. We are interested in formal programs existing at the campus level, not in opportunities provided ad hoc to individuals by Department Chairs, et al.)

[ ] Check here if none, and proceed to Question XI on Page 13

	TYPES OF PROGRAMS FOR DIRECT SUPPORT	PURPOSES/GOALS
A.		
B.		
C.		
D.		
E.		
F.		

NOTE THAT ALTHOUGH WE HAVE LEFT SPACE FOR ONLY SIX DIRECT SUPPORT PROGRAMS, WE ARE INTERESTED IN ALL OF THEM. IF SERVICES EXCEED THIS NUMBER, PLEASE REPRODUCE THE PAGES FOR QUESTIONS VI AND VII AS NEEDED.

DESCRIPTION OF DIRECT SUPPORT TO FACULTY

VII. Please describe the nature of the programs for support on the facing page, including:

- o whether it existed prior to FY 1981;
- o whether the service continues in FY 1986-'87;
- o whether it has a defined termination date;
- o the number of faculty served (if available).

ACTIVITY A LISTED IN QUESTION VI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?	2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?	3. Does it have a known termination date?
☐ 1. Yes	☐ 1. Yes	☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No	☐ 2. No	☐ 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

_ _ _ _ # of faculty

☐ Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY B LISTED IN QUESTION VI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?	2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?	3. Does it have a known termination date?
☐ 1. Yes	☐ 1. Yes	☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No	☐ 2. No	☐ 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

_ _ _ _ # of faculty

☐ Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

(question VII, continued: DESCRIPTION OF DIRECT SUPPORT TO FACULTY)

ACTIVITY C, LISTED IN QUESTION VI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   ☐ 1. Yes
   ☐ 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   ☐ 1. Yes
   ☐ 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   ☐ 1. Yes
   ☐ 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   ☐ Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY D LISTED IN QUESTION VI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   ☐ 1. Yes
   ☐ 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   ☐ 1. Yes
   ☐ 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   ☐ 1. Yes
   ☐ 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   ☐ Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

(Question VII, continued: DESCRIPTION OF DIRECT SUPPORT TO FACULTY)

ACTIVITY E. LISTED IN QUESTION VI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY F LISTED IN QUESTION VI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

FY 1985-'86 EXPENDITURES FOR DIRECT SUPPORT TO FACULTY

VIII. Please indicate total expenditures for direct services for faculty development; see the Rules of Thumb for assistance in developing this figure).

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 (Grand) Total for direct services in faculty development, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

A. Of this total, please estimate, if possible, the total expenditure related specifically to instruction, (including methods, curriculum development, assessing student progress or advising students).

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total for Instructional Purposes, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

B. If you cannot estimate the total expenditure related specifically to instruction, can you estimate the following:

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total definitely for Instructional Purposes, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total definitely not for Instructional purposes, including fringe, but not overhead

IX. For the Grand total for faculty development, please tell us the amount spent in the following categories:

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Salaries and benefits

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Fees (e.g. consultants, visiting scholars, etc.)

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Supplies and Equipment

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Travel and Per Diem

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Other (for example, membership costs in professional organizations directly related to the above)

FY 1985-'86 EXPENDITURES FOR DIRECT SUPPORT TO FACULTY
- continued -

X. Again, for the grand total of expenditures for direct support, please indicate the amount of revenue from each of the following sources:

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 System-wide dollars specifically earmarked for faculty improvement activities

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Campus/State -- i.e. any funds that are part of the state-provided campus budget

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Campus/Other -- i.e. Non-state funding at the campus level, e.g. indirect fees from grants reassigned for faculty development purposes.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 State Agency -- Grants from the state for research or other faculty development activities.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 State/Other -- Funding from specific state monies earmarked for faculty development, e.g. irrigation study grants

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Federal funding -- Funding only from federal agencies related to faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Private funding raised from donations and used specifically for faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Funding by Professional Organizations for faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Other sources of support for funding these activities.

MIXED DIRECT SERVICES AND SUPPORT FOR FACULTY TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION; RESEARCH; PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE; OR SCHOLARSHIP

XI. Please briefly describe the programs of **mixed** services and support provided to faculty for any or all of the following purposes -- improving instructional skills (e.g. methods, curricula, assessment of student abilities or techniques for advising); research or performance development for the fine and creative arts; scholarship and maintaining currency in a field. (Please do not include programs or services specifically for women or minority faculty; these are included in Question XVI on Page 19)

Please see Rules of Thumb for assistance with identifying these activities.

[ ] Check here if none, and proceed to Question XVI on Page 19

	TYPES OF DIRECT SERVICES	PURPOSES/GOALS
A.		
B.		
C.		
D.		
E.		
F.		

NOTE THAT ALTHOUGH WE HAVE LEFT SPACE FOR ONLY SIX MIXED PROGRAMS OF SERVICES AND SUPPORT, WE ARE INTERESTED IN ALL OF THEM. IF SERVICES EXCEED THIS NUMBER, PLEASE REPRODUCE THE PAGES FOR QUESTIONS XI AND XII AS NEEDED.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS OF MIXED SERVICES AND SUPPORT TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, ARTS PERFORMANCES, OR MAINTAINING CURRENCY

XII. Please describe the nature of each program/service on the facing page, including:

- o whether it existed prior to FY 1981;
- o whether the service continues in FY 1986-'87;
- o whether it has a defined termination date;
- o the number of faculty served (if available).

ACTIVITY A LISTED IN QUESTION XI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY B LISTED IN QUESTION XI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

(Question XII, continued: DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS OF MIXED SERVICES AND SUPPORT)

ACTIVITY C, LISTED IN QUESTION XI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY D LISTED IN QUESTION XI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

(Question XII, continued: DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS OF MIXED SERVICES AND SUPPORT)

ACTIVITY E. LISTED IN QUESTION XI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY F LISTED IN QUESTION XI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/service/facility?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

FY 1985-'86 EXPENDITURES FOR PROGRAMS OF MIXED DIRECT SERVICES AND SUPPORT

XIII. Please indicate total expenditures for programs of mixed services and support for faculty development; see the Rules of Thumb for assistance in developing this figure).

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 (Grand) Total for direct services in faculty development, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

A. Of this total, please estimate, if possible, the total expenditure related specifically to instruction, (including methods, curriculum development, assessing student progress or advising students).

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total for Instructional Purposes, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

B. If you cannot estimate the total expenditure related specifically to instruction, can you estimate the following:

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total definitely for Instructional Purposes, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total definitely not for Instructional purposes, including fringe, but not overhead

XIV. For the Grand total for faculty development, please tell us the amount spent in the following categories:

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Salaries and benefits

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Fees (e.g. consultants, visiting scholars, etc.)

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Supplies and Equipment

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Travel and Per Diem

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Other (for example, membership costs in professional organizations directly related to the above)

FY 1985-'86 EXPENDITURES FOR PROGRAMS OF MIXED SERVICES AND SUPPORT
- continued -

XV. Again, for the grand total of expenditures for programs of mixed services and support, please indicate the amount of revenue from each of the following sources:

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 System-wide dollars specifically earmarked for faculty improvement activities

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Campus/State -- i.e. any funds that are part of the state-provided campus budget

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Campus/Other -- i.e. Non-state funding at the campus level, e.g. indirect fees from grants reassigned for faculty development purposes.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 State Agency -- Grants from the state for research or other faculty development activities.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 State/Other -- Funding from specific state monies earmarked for faculty development, e.g. irrigation study grants

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Federal funding -- Funding only from federal agencies related to faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Private funding raised from donations and used specifically for faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Funding by Professional Organizations for faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Other sources of support for funding these activities.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS DEDICATED TO IMPROVING FACULTY SKILLS

XVI. Please describe the affirmative action programs which provide support to faculty for any purpose.

(Examples might include direct grants for released time; travel related to improving in the above purposes. We are interested in formal programs existing on the campus level, not in opportunities provided ad hoc to individual faculty by Department Chairs or others.)

[ ] Check here if none, and proceed to Question XXI on Page 25

	TYPES OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS FOR FACULTY	PURPOSES/GOALS
A.		
B.		
C.		
D.		
E.		
F.		

NOTE THAT ALTHOUGH WE HAVE LEFT SPACE FOR ONLY SIX AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS, WE ARE INTERESTED IN ALL OF THEM. IF SERVICES EXCEED THIS NUMBER, PLEASE REPRODUCE THE PAGES FOR QUESTIONS XVI AND XVII AS NEEDED.

DESCRIPTION OF FACULTY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

XVII. Please describe the nature of the faculty affirmative action programs listed on the facing page, including:

- o whether it existed prior to FY 1981;
- o whether the service continues in FY 1986-'87;
- o whether it has a defined termination date;
- o the number of faculty served (if available).

ACTIVITY A LISTED IN QUESTION XVI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No
2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No
3. Does it have a known termination date?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY B LISTED IN QUESTION XVI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No
2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No
3. Does it have a known termination date?
   - [ ] 1. Yes
   - [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

(Question XVII, continued: DESCRIPTION OF FACULTY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS)

ACTIVITY C, LISTED IN QUESTION XVI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY D LISTED IN QUESTION XVI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

(Question XVII, continued: DESCRIPTION OF FACULTY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

ACTIVITY E. LISTED IN QUESTION XVI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

ACTIVITY F LISTED IN QUESTION XVI

1. Did this program exist in FY 1980?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

2. Does it continue in FY 1986-87?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

3. Does it have a known termination date?
   [ ] 1. Yes
   [ ] 2. No

4. How many faculty were served in FY 1985-'86 through this program/support?

   _ _ _ _ # of faculty

   [ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available.

FY 1985-'86 EXPENDITURES FOR FACULTY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

XVIII. Please indicate total expenditures for direct support provided to women and minority faculty.

(See the Rules of Thumb for assistance in developing this figure.)

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 (Grand) Total for direct services in faculty development, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

A. Of this total, please estimate, if possible, the total expenditure related specifically to instruction, (including methods, curriculum development, assessing student progress or advising students).

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total for women and minority faculty for Instructional Purposes, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

B. If you cannot estimate the total expenditure related specifically to instruction, can you estimate the following:

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total definitely for Instructional Purposes, including fringe benefits, but not overhead

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total definitely not for Instructional purposes, including fringe, but not overhead

XIX. For the Grand total for faculty development, please tell us the amount spent in the following categories:

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Salaries and benefits

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Fees (e.g. consultants, visiting scholars, etc.)

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Supplies and Equipment

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Travel and Per Diem

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Other (for example, membership costs in professional organizations directly related to the above)

FY 1985-'86 EXPENDITURES FOR FACULTY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS
- continued -

XX. Again, for the grand total of expenditures for direct support, please indicate the amount of revenue from each of the following sources:

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 System-wide dollars specifically earmarked for faculty improvement activities

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Campus/State -- i.e. any funds that are part of the state-provided campus budget

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Campus/Other -- i.e. Non-state funding at the campus level, e.g. indirect fees from grants reassigned for faculty development purposes.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 State Agency -- Grants from the state for research or other faculty development activities.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 State/Other -- Funding from specific state monies earmarked for faculty development, e.g. irrigation study grants

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Federal funding -- Funding only from federal agencies related to faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Private funding raised from donations and used specifically for faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Funding by Professional Organizations for faculty development.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Other sources of support for funding these activities.

SABBATIC LEAVES AND PROFESSIONAL LEAVES WITHOUT PAY

XXI. From FY 1982-83 to FY 1985-86, how many faculty have taken sabbatic leave? (Please include all sabbatics -- quarter, semester, year)

_ _ _ _ # faculty who have taken sabbatic leave

[ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available, and continue with Question XXII.

How many faculty FTE does this represent?

_ _ _ # FTE for faculty who have taken sabbatic leave

XXII. From FY 1982-83 to 1985-86, how many faculty have taken leave without pay for professional (not personal) reasons?

_ _ _ _ # faculty who have taken leave without pay.

[ ] Check here if you can't make an accurate estimate because records are not available, and continue with question XXIII on the next page.

How many faculty FTE does this represent?

_ _ _ # FTE for faculty who have taken leave without pay.

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

XXIII. Do you have AFFIRMATIVE ACTION programs which provide support to non-instructional staff?

(Examples might include direct services in the form of workshops provided to non-instructional staff, fee waivers for courses, direct grants for released time; travel related to the above. We are interested in formal programs existing on the campus level, not in opportunities provided ad hoc to individual staff by Department Chairs or others.)

[ ] 1. Yes
[ ] 2. No (Please continue with Question XXVII on Page 27)

XXIV. How many affirmative action programs/services/facilities are there?

__ # of programs/services/facilities targetting the development of skills of women or minority non-instructional staff

XXV. Please indicate the total expenditures for the services targetted for women and minority non-instructional staff. See the Rules of Thumb for assistance in developing this figure).

$_ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Total amount, including fringe, but not including overhead

XXVI. Please indicate the amount of revenue for these purposes from each of the following sources:

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 System-wide dollars specifically earmarked for affirmative action for non-instructional staff.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Campus/State -- i.e. any funds that are part of the state-provided campus budget used for this purpose.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Campus/Other -- i.e. Non-state funding at the campus level, e.g. indirect fees from grants reassigned for affirmative action for non-instructional staff.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 State Agency -- Grants from the state used for these purposes.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 State/Other -- Funding from specific state monies earmarked for these purposes.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Federal funding -- Funding only from federal agencies related to these purposes.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Private funding raised from donations and used for this.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Funding by Professional Organizations for this purpose.

$ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.00 Other sources of support for funding these activities.

NEED FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

We are interested in the views of your Campus Administration on areas of greatest need for professional development.

XXVII. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE FOLLOWING FACULTY *ISSUES CURRENTLY SUPPORTED*, and what emphasis be placed on them in the next 5 years?

	CURRENT Adequacy of Support					HOW SHOULD Emphasis be Changed				
	Very Low		About Right		Extr High	Much Less		Stay Same		Much Highr
Improving faculty instructional skills (inclu. teaching style or skills in presenting material in class, or teaching approach, or use of technology).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Developing curricula (inclu. learning how to augment or improve a broad program of study or how to create or improve course materials; creating or revising courses).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Addressing student learning needs (inclu. improving skills in assessing student progress or developing awareness of the cultural perspectives affecting learning styles of ethnic minorities, or developing skills in teaching students limited in English proficiency, or improving techniques of advising students).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Increasing knowledge and/or other research/performance activities (inclu. contributing knowledge, or enhancing research skills.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Maintaining currency in the field.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Retraining faculty to teach in new areas.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

NEED FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
- continued -

XXVIII. If your campus had $ X additional funds for use in the following areas, what percent of these funds should be allocated to each area? Please be sure the percentages add up to 100%.

_ _ _ % a) Office space

_ _ _ % b) Clerical and technical support

_ _ _ % c) Equipment

_ _ _ % d) Equipment maintenance

_ _ _% e) Reduction of teaching loads

_ _ _% f) Reduction of total non-teaching workload

1 0 0% Total Funds

NEED FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
- continued -

XXIX. Given all of the above, with limited dollars available, in what areas are the greatest needs for faculty professional development?

From the perspective of your campus administration:

A. In what areas do faculty generally need the most professional development?

_____

_____

B. Where are your greatest needs for additional funds for faculty development (i.e. sabbatic, travel, secretary support, etc.)?

_____

_____

C. Is there currently a written plan or needs assessment on your campus regarding faculty development?

[ ] 1. Yes - Please complete parts D and E below

[ ] 2. No - This concludes the questionnaire, Thank you

D. Do yo you have:

[ ] 1. Plans

[ ] 2. Needs Assessment

[ ] 3. Both Plans and Needs Assessment

E. Please summarize the main conclusions of the Plans or Needs Assessment.

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANKS AGAIN FOR YOUR FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of January 1988, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, *Chairperson*
Henry Der, San Francisco
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles, *Vice Chairperson*
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto
Thomas E. Stang, Los Angeles
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; appointed by the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University

Borgny Baird, Long Beach; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Kenneth L. Peters, Tarzana; appointed by the California State Board of Education

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by California's independent colleges and universities

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, William H. Pickens, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814; telephone (916) 445-7933.

EXPLORING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION: VOLUME THREE

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 88-20

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

88-6 Comments on Educational Equity Plans of the Segments: A Staff Report on the Development of Plans by the State Department of Education, the California State University, and the University of California to Achieve the Educational Equity Goals of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83 (1984) (February 1988)

88-7 Size, Growth, and Cost of Administration at the California State University: A Report Prepared by Price Waterhouse and MGT Consultants for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (February 1988)

88-8 Overview of the 1988-89 Governor's Budget for Postsecondary Education in California: Testimony by William H. Pickens, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1988)

88-9 Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1988-89: The Commission's 1987 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) (March 1988)

88-10 Eligibility of California's 1986 High School Graduates for Admission to Its Public Universities: A Report of the 1986 High School Eligibility Study (March 1988)

88-11 Eligibility for Freshman Admission to the University of California: A Statement to the Regents of the University by William H. Pickens, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 18, 1988 (March 1988)

88-12 Time to Degree in California's Public Universities: Factors Contributing to the Length of Time Undergraduates Take to Earn Their Bachelor's Degree (March 1988)

88-13 Evaluation of the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP): A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 2398 (Chapter 620, Statutes of 1984) (March 1988)

88-14 Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California During 1987: The Third in a Series of Annual Reports Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1758 (Chapter 1505, Statutes of 1984) (March 1988)

88-15 Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics Fall 1987: University of California, The California State University, and California's Independent Colleges and Universities (March 1988)

88-16 Legislative Update, March 1988: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1988)

88-17 State Policy for Faculty Development in California Public Higher Education: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1986 Budget Act (May 1988)

88-18 to 20 Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education: Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by Berman, Weiler Associates:

88-18 Volume One: Executive Summary and Conclusions, by Paul Berman and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)

88-19 Volume Two: Findings, by Paul Berman, Jo-Ann Intili and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)

88-20 Volume Three: Appendix, by Paul Berman, Jo-Ann Intili, and Daniel Weiler, January 1988 (March 1988)

88-21 Staff Development in California's Public Schools: Recommendations of the Policy Development Committee for the California Staff Development Policy Study, March 16, 1988 (March 1988)

88-22 and 23 Staff Development in California: Public and Personal Investments, Program Patterns, and Policy Choices, by Judith Warren Little, William H. Gerritz, David S. Stern, James W. Guthrie, Michael W. Kirst, and David D. Marsh. A Joint Publication of Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development • Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), December 1987.

88-22 Executive Summary (March 1988)

88-23 Report (March 1988)